

**HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD**  
***PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA***  
*Central Washington University, Barge 412 (Boardroom)*  
*Ellensburg, Washington*  
July 25 – 26, 2000

***Tuesday, July 25***

***President's Reception Center***

12:00 – 1:15    **HECB Luncheon**  
(No formal Board action will be taken at this time.)

1:30 – 3:15    **HECB Planning Session**

3:30 – 5:00    **HECB Training, Sr. Asst. AG Howard Fischer**

**B R E A K**

6:00 – 8:00    **Dinner with Pres. Jerilyn McIntyre**

**HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD**  
**PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA**  
*Central Washington University, Barge 412 (Boardroom)*  
*Ellensburg, Washington*  
July 25 – 26, 2000

**Wednesday, July 26**

*Approximate  
Times*

*Tab*

**7:45 a.m.      Board Breakfast and Meeting Overview**  
(No official business will be conducted at this time.)

**8:30            Campus Tour**

**9:30            Welcome and Introductions**  
Bob Craves, Chair  
Pres. Jerilyn McIntyre, welcome remarks

**Adoption HECB Meeting Minutes** **1**  
• May 25, 2000 Board Meeting  
• June 26, 2000 Joint Meeting with the SBCTC

**I N F O R M A T I O N   I T E M S**

**Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) Study** **2**  
• HECB staff briefing

**(Legislative) Distance Learning Study** **3**  
• HECB staff briefing

**A C T I O N   I T E M S**

**HECB Diversity Study, Progress Report** **4**  
• HECB staff briefing  
(Resolution 00-22)

**HECB Preliminary 2001-2003 Budget Request** **5**  
• Fiscal Subcommittee Briefing  
(Resolution 00-23)

<b>High-demand Enrollments</b>	<b>6</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HECB staff briefing (<i>Resolution 00-24</i>)</li> </ul>	

**12:00 – 1:15 LUNCH** (No official business will be conducted at this time)

## MASTER PLAN UPDATE

<b>Enrollment and Capital Assumptions Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HECB staff briefing</li> <li>• Public Comment (<i>Resolution 00-25</i>)</li> </ul>	
<b>Rules Review/Program Review</b>	<b>8</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HECB staff briefing</li> <li>• Participants discussion</li> </ul>	
<b>E-learning Training Initiative</b>	<b>9</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HECB staff briefing</li> </ul>	

## CONSENT AGENDA

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MA Professional Accountancy</b>, CWU at Ellensburg, SeaTac and Lynnwood Center (<i>Resolution 00-26</i>)</li> </ul>	<b>10</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BS in Environmental Science</b>, UW Tacoma and UW Bothell (<i>Resolution 00-27</i>)</li> </ul>	<b>11</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Master of Arts</b>, UW Tacoma (<i>Resolution 00-28</i>)</li> </ul>	<b>12</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BA in Environmental Studies</b>, UW Seattle (<i>Resolution 00-29</i>)</li> </ul>	<b>13</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BA in Education</b>, WSU at NW Indian College (<i>Resolution 00-30</i>)</li> </ul>	<b>14</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BA in Education</b>, WSU at Centralia, Lower Columbia and Clark Colleges, and WSU Vancouver (<i>Resolution 00-31</i>)</li> </ul>	<b>15</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BS in Manufacturing Engineering at Boeing</b>, WSU (<i>Resolution 00-32</i>)</li> </ul>	<b>16</b>

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURN

*If you are a person with disability and require an accommodation for attendance, or need this agenda in an alternative format, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7800 as soon as possible to allow sufficient time to make arrangements. We also can be reached through our Telecommunication Device for the Deaf at (360) 753-7809.*

**2000 HECB Meeting Calendar**

<i>DAY/DATE</i>	<i>TYPE</i>	<i>TENTATIVE LOCATION</i>
August	No meeting	
September 19 (Tues.)	Regular meeting	WSU, Pullman CUB 125 & 127
October 26 (Thurs.)	Regular meeting	Olympia JAC, SHR4
November	No meeting	
December 1 (Fri.)	Regular meeting	UPS, Tacoma Board Room

## **HECB MEETING MINUTES**

### **For May 25, 2000**

*July 2000*

#### **HECB Members Present**

Dr. Gay Selby, Vice Chair  
Mr. Larry Hanson  
Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins  
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn  
Ms. Pat Stanford

#### **HECB Staff**

Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director  
Ms. Linda Schactler, Deputy Director  
Mr. Bruce Botka, Dir., Governmental Relations  
Ms. Becki Collins, Dir., Education Services  
Mr. John Fricke, Associate Director  
Mr. Doug Scrima, Policy Associate  
Mr. Jim Reed, Associate Director  
Ms. Linda LaMar, Associate Director  
Ms. Elaine Jones, Associate Director

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

Dr. Gay Selby, HECB Vice Chair, welcomed meeting participants and initiated Board introductions. Dr. Karen Morse, Western Washington University president, welcomed the Board to WWU, which is celebrating its centennial year.

Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director, reviewed the day's agenda. He called the Board's attention to a resolution under the Master Plan section (Tab 5) endorsing a new approach to analyzing enrollment issues and capital needs. He also noted a series of resolutions for the board's consideration that recognize the work of certain college and university presidents and a HECB staff member.

#### **Minutes of March 30, 2000, Board Meeting**

**Mr. Larry Hanson** moved for approval of the minutes with the correction of the spelling of Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins' name. **Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins** seconded. The minutes were approved.

#### **2000 Legislative Session Summary**

Bruce Botka, HECB Director of Governmental Relations, reviewed legislative action on key HECB priorities and other higher education issues. A highlight of the last legislation session was an increase in high-demand FTEs. Recognizing that funds remained from the first round of allocations, the Legislature authorized the Board to allocate an additional 50 FTEs from the proposals submitted in the fall.

Bruce reviewed the Board's legislative priorities.

- A compromise version of SCR 8425, adopting the 2000 Master Plan, was approved.
- The Promise Scholarship, although not signed into law, continues to exist as an element of the budget. The supplemental budget included a \$2.4 million funding increase to expand eligibility to include students in the top 15% of the graduating class and to those who achieve a 1200 SAT score on their first attempt.

- HECB staff is working with the institutions to address accountability. The HECB will submit their recommendations to the Legislature in November.
- The supplemental budget included \$1 million money for a demonstration program to provide Future Teachers Conditional Scholarship Loans to K-12 classified employees who are interested in becoming certificated teachers. Dr. Gay Selby voiced her concern that people could start in a program only to find out that the project is not funded in the next biennium.
- HB 2952 directs the HECB to work with other organizations and institutions on a wide-ranging study on distance education.
- The HECB has been directed to conduct a study of Washington State University shifting from a semester to a quarter system.

Mr. Botka reviewed the directives received this year from the 2000 Legislature. He reported that HECB staff would continue to communicate regularly with the Legislature regarding specific assigned tasks in the 2000 Master Plan.

He also reviewed the many reports and recommendations the HECB will need to produce for the 2001 legislative session. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins asked how the HECB would approach the report for the Faculty Salary Peer Review. "Who would be the peer institutions? Have other states been asked how they manage faculty salary increases in their state budgets?" Mr. Botka remarked that the report would probably look very similar to the one done a couple of years ago. The state established a list of comparable institutions about 12 years ago. It was suggested that in preparing this report, information from the impact of the last biennial salary increase be used.

### **Educational Opportunity Grant Study Update**

Becki Collins, HECB Director of Educational Services, and Linda LaMar, HECB Associate Director, reported on the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG). The EOG targets students who are unable to complete a four-year degree because of various obstacles, e.g., family or employment commitments, health concerns, and financial need. To assist students, the EOG provides special grant funds to students, allowing them to attend institutions with existing capacity anywhere in the state. The HECB is doing a study to evaluate the program's effectiveness in achieving its goals. The study will include a policy analysis to consider whether statutory modifications should be proposed. A report and recommendations will be submitted to the Board for consideration and action at its July meeting.

### **Competency-based Admissions Standards Project**

Doug Scrima, HECB Policy Associate, reviewed the background of the Competency-based Admissions Standards Project for the Board. He said the project has been very successful and has given the postsecondary community a crucial role in the state's education reform efforts. The evaluation by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) ends Phase I of this project. Funding provided through a state appropriation and through two grants from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education will end in June.

Dr. Karen Paulson, Research Associate for the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHMES), reviewed the findings of the evaluation. She said the HECB's work has been well integrated with reforms instituted within K-12, but that the system

has been only partially implemented and additional work is needed. She made the following recommendations:

- The Admissions Standards Action Committee should be dissolved and be reconstituted as a high-level council, charged with making policy recommendations regarding the effects of education reform changes within all sectors linking K-12 and postsecondary education.
- An independent, non-profit parallel organization should be created to publicize all aspects of education reform in the state, including those occurring at the postsecondary level.
- The impact of the new competency-based admissions system must be assessed.
- The HECB should consider expanding its role as a data repository and analysis site in order to carry out studies of the competency-based admissions system.
- The competency-based admissions system and the processes supporting the system must be made a legislative budget priority.

Mr. Larry Hanson asked whether the competency-based system has addressed the issue of workforce development. Mr. Scrima said Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board members serve on the Admissions Standards Action Committee.

Mr. Scrima said more discussions will occur with the Board on how this should be incorporated into the budget.

### **Master Plan Update**

Linda Schactler, HECB Deputy Director, said the Master Plan directed the HECB to consult with the Office of Financial Management and collaborate with the public and independent colleges and universities, private vocational schools and appropriate legislative committees “to prepare an enrollment accommodation plan, contemplate various growth scenarios, identify related operational and capital needs, and examine alternatives to address the identified budget needs.” Forty-six people have met over the last month and have formed working groups to review and discuss enrollment and capital budget issues.

**Enrollment:** John Fricke, HECB Associate Director, said initial discussions have yielded a draft enrollment framework for the Board’s consideration that refines the assumptions of the Master Plan and is designed to give policy-makers greater flexibility in planning for future enrollment needs.

Dr. Gay Selby said if there is not a clear consensus among all of the stakeholders around the policy issues and the way data will be tracked and evaluated.

**Space Planning and Capital Budgeting:** Jim Reed, HECB Associate Director, said the work group has reviewed the space planning assumptions and associated capital cost estimates included in the Master Plan, but has not made any recommendations.

The House Capital Budget Committee Co-chairs and the Senate Ways & Means Chair sent a letter seeking changes in the HECB capital budget recommendation process for 2001-03. Mr. Reed and Mr. Fricke have formulated a concept, which tries to respond to the intent of the letter and the needs of the Legislature, and at the same time tries to recognize some of the concerns that have been expressed by the institutions in developing a consolidated, integrated priority list.

This concept will be presented to the work group and a draft will be presented to the Board's Capital Subcommittee.

**ACTION:** **Mr. Larry Hanson** moved for approval of Resolution 00-16, which transmits to the Legislature the draft enrollment framework and requests their approval to continue, acknowledges the Legislature's direction of refining the approach and recommendations on capital budgets, and continues communication with the Legislature. **Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

**Competency-Based Degrees:** Elaine Jones, HECB Associate Director, reported to the Board that HECB staff have developed a proposal for a competency-based associate transfer degree and a couple of competency-based baccalaureate degree programs in a professional field, such as nursing or education. The pilot would engage three existing campuses where a partnership now exists between a two- and four-year institution, such as UW Bothell/Cascadia, CWU Lynwood Center/Edmonds, and EWU/Spokane Falls. The project work plan and selection of institutional partners will be completed in June.

**Rules Review:** Jim Reed reported that a comprehensive review is underway to study how existing regulations or practices at the state and institutional levels could be changed to better meet the needs of learners. All public institutions, faculty representatives and students, have been invited to participate. A report of the findings and proposed solutions is planned for July.

#### **Consent Agenda**

- Associate in Science Transfer Degree (Resolution 00-12)
- MS Engineering Technology, CWU at Ellensburg, Puyallup, and Auburn (Resolution 00-13)
- BA Elementary Education, WSU Tri-Cities (Resolution 00-14)
- MS in Agriculture, WSU Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho (Resolution 00-15)

**ACTION:** There being no discussion of consent agenda items, **Mr. Larry Hanson** moved for approval of Resolution 00-12, Resolution 00-13, Resolution 00-14, and Resolution 00-15. **Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.



**Director's Report**

- Diversity Conference - Mr. Gaspard thanked the Board members for their participation at a national conference in Seattle. Hosted by the HECB and the Office of the Governor, the two-day event was sponsored by the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), the College Board, the Education Commission of the States, and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE). Conference participants explored ways to increase higher education opportunities, especially for people from traditionally underrepresented groups.
- G.E.T. Program – The last day to purchase units at this year's price is June 30. The Governor appointed two additional committee members. In addition, the Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development has loaned the program an outreach coordinator for six months to
- Resolutions – Mr. Gaspard presented to the Board for its consideration Resolutions 00-17, 00-18, 00-19, and 00-20, recognizing the contributions of President Jane Jervis of The Evergreen State College, President Ivory Nelson and Interim President James Norton of Central Washington University, and President Samuel Smith of Washington State University.

ACTION: **Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins** moved for approval of Resolution 00-17, Resolution 00-18, Resolution 00-19, and Resolution 00-20. **Mr. Larry Hanson** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. Gaspard presented to the Board for its consideration Resolution 00-21, which recognizes the contributions of Senior Associate Director, Dan Keller for his 14 years of service with the HECB.

ACTION: **Mr. Larry Hanson** moved for approval of Resolution 00-21. **Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

**The meeting was adjourned at 12 Noon.**

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-12**

WHEREAS, RCW 28B.80.350 and RCW 28B.80.280 require the Higher Education Coordinating Board to establish transfer policies and, in cooperation with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, to establish and maintain a statewide transfer of credit policy and agreement; and,

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board supports the efforts of public higher education institutions to collectively meet the needs of students; and

WHEREAS, This agreement will allow students to transfer credits more easily from community college to baccalaureate institutions in science-related disciplines; and

WHEREAS, An associate in science transfer agreement has been negotiated by the community colleges, the public baccalaureate institutions, and the staff of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, Higher Education Coordinating Board, and Council of Presidents Office; and

WHEREAS, The associate in science degree was approved by the baccalaureate institutions' provosts and the Community College Instruction Commission;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts as Board policy the Associate in Science Transfer Agreement among the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and baccalaureate institutions.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Shaw, Secretary

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-13**

WHEREAS, Central Washington University has requested approval to establish a Master of Science in Engineering Technology at CWU Ellensburg, Pierce College in Puyallup, and Boeing in Auburn; and

WHEREAS, The program appears popular among students and employers; and

WHEREAS, The program of study and resources are sufficient to accommodate student needs; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews endorsed establishing the program in multiple locations;

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable for offering the program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Central Washington University proposal to establish a Master of Science in Engineering Technology at CWU Ellensburg, Pierce College in Puyallup, and Boeing in Auburn.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Shaw, Secretary

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-14**

WHEREAS, Washington State University is seeking approval for its existing Bachelor of Arts in Education at WSU Tri-Cities; and

WHEREAS, There is continuing need for this program to meet the demand for elementary teachers in the region; and

WHEREAS, The program has a well-developed curriculum, assessment and diversity plans, and student learning outcomes established by the state; and

WHEREAS, The program is delivered in partnership with Columbia Basin Community College; and

WHEREAS, The program is supported through reallocation at a reasonable cost;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education at WSU Tri-Cities, effective June 2000.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Shaw, Secretary

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-15**

WHEREAS, Washington State University proposes to establish a Master of Science Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho; and

WHEREAS, The program has the potential to contribute to the agriculture industry and multi-media instructional delivery; and

WHEREAS, The program would be offered collaboratively with Oregon State University and the University of Idaho; and

WHEREAS, The resources are adequate to support a quality program and instructional costs are reasonable; and

WHEREAS, The assessment plan should facilitate advanced teaching and learning;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves Washington State Universities request to establish a Master of Science in Agriculture Extended Degree Program in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, effective June 2000. Furthermore, on an annual basis, WSU will submit actual costs for the distance education courses, including the actual costs associated with delivery via distance education technologies. Finally, at the end of the second year of the program, WSU will submit to HECB staff all assessment information related to program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

---

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

---

David Shaw, Secretary

## **RESOLUTION NO. 00-16**

WHEREAS, The Washington State Legislature has approved Engrossed Substitute Senate Concurrent Resolution 8425, commending the Higher Education Coordinating Board for its work in producing the 2000 update of the Master Plan for Higher Education entitled: "The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner"; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has directed the Board and its staff to refine and re-examine its assumptions and forecasts of enrollment growth and related capital needs of the state's public colleges and universities, including the role of the community and technical colleges in accommodating additional higher education students; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has asked the HECB to communicate regularly regarding these assigned tasks; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has directed the Board to proceed with the implementation of the Master Plan as provided in ESSCR 8425, and to report to the 2001 Legislature on the progress of such implementation; and

WHEREAS, The Board has reviewed an approach to forecasting long-term higher education enrollment demand in Washington State on the basis of clearly identified economic factors and policy options; and

WHEREAS, This new enrollment forecasting approach has been developed in collaboration with institutions of higher education, the Office of Financial Management, and a wide range of organizations representing educational policy-makers across Washington State, as directed in ESSCR 8425;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board endorses this approach to examining alternatives regarding the enrollment issues raised in the Legislature's Master Plan resolution as presented at the Board's May 25, 2000, meeting; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the HECB, in collaboration with the institutions of higher education, continue to refine its approach, priorities, and recommendations for the capital needs of the state's public institutions of higher education; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the staff of the HECB is directed to communicate this resolution and related information to the appropriate members and committees of the Legislature and the Office of the Governor, and to the institutions and organizations that have been involved in the development process; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board express its sincere appreciation to the Legislature for the passage of ESSCR 8425, and to the many people who have participated in the fruitful discussions that have led to the development of this new approach to analyzing enrollment issues and capital needs.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Larry Hanson, Member

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-17**

WHEREAS, Dr. Jane Jervis has served as President of The Evergreen State College for eight years; and

WHEREAS, Under her capable leadership, Evergreen has become one of the most frequently praised higher education institutions in the nation, and has been recognized as having an intellectual climate that is “unparalleled in higher education”; and

WHEREAS, President Jervis is widely recognized as a leading advocate for affordable tuition, increased financial aid, and access for minority and students of color; and

WHEREAS, Jane Jervis has earned the respect of her colleagues for her knowledge of higher education issues and her commitment and dedication to improving services provided to students and their families; and

WHEREAS, Her graciousness, and steadfast devotion to students will be greatly missed by her friends and colleagues;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board members and staff express their appreciation and admiration to President Jane Jervis for her contributions to higher education in the state of Washington.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

---

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

---

Larry Hanson, Board Member

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-18**

WHEREAS, Dr. Ivory V. Nelson was president of Central Washington University from January 1992 until August 1999; and

WHEREAS, During President Nelson's tenure, CWU extended its services to students in communities around the state; and

WHEREAS, President Nelson was responsible for CWU's growth in technology, including participation in a statewide distance education network, collaborative consortia, and university-wide technology upgrades; and

WHEREAS, Under Ivory Nelson's skillful administration, Central Washington University received an unprecedented \$160 million in capital improvements; and

WHEREAS, President Nelson played a pivotal role in strengthening Central Washington University as a place of teaching and learning for diverse student populations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board members and staff express their appreciation to President Nelson for his contributions to higher education in the state, and his services to our students and their families.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

---

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

---

Larry Hanson, Board Member



**RESOLUTION NO. 00-19**

WHEREAS, Dr. James Norton has served as Interim President of Central Washington University since August 1999 and will turn over the reins to incoming president Dr. Jerilyn McIntyre in July 2000; and

WHEREAS, Since retiring from the University of Virginia in 1988, Dr. Norton has continued his support of higher education by serving as interim president at Hiram College, Bryant College, and Adelphi University; and interim chancellor of the University of Maryland system, and the Lamar University system; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Norton has had a distinguished career in education, administration, and public service, administering numerous philanthropic and civic programs, and coordinating policy and administration of higher education for 61 Ohio public campuses; and

WHEREAS, He has helped Central Washington University successfully bridge the gap between the outgoing and incoming presidents; and

WHEREAS, His gracious leadership and devotion to students has won the support and admiration of his friends and colleagues;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board members and staff express their appreciation to President James Norton for his contributions to higher education in the state of Washington.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Larry Hanson, Board Member

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-20**

WHEREAS, Dr. Samuel S. Smith has been president of Washington State University since July 1985, and has announced his retirement effective July 1, 2000; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Smith has been a member and leader of various state, regional, and national higher education organizations, including the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Universities and Colleges, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Kellogg Commission on State and Land Grant Universities, the Western Governors University, and numerous others; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Smith is highly regarded in the state and in the region for his dynamic and visionary leadership; and

WHEREAS, Under his skillful and inspired administration, Washington State University has grown into a multi- institutional system; and

WHEREAS, During his years of service, President Smith has earned the admiration and respect of his friends and colleagues, and the Higher Education Coordinating Board members and staff;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board members and staff express their appreciation to President Sam Smith for his contributions to the cause of higher education in the state, and convey to him their highest personal and professional regard.

Adopted:

May 25, 2000

Attest:

---

Gay Selby, Vice Chair

---

Larry Hanson, Board Member

RESOLUTION 00-21

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has been the fortunate employer of Dan Keller for \_\_\_ years; and

WHEREAS, Dan's work has encompassed \_\_\_ Master Plans, the development of branch campuses, the expansion of student financial aid, and many other significant higher education initiatives; and

WHEREAS, Dan also has been an invaluable resource for staff of the Legislature and the Office of the Governor, for higher education institutions, and at least two "blue-ribbon" higher education commissions; and

WHEREAS, As the HECB's budget staff leader, Dan put forth the most "**Critical**" budgetary needs of public higher education, in a manner that clearly demonstrates the "**Essential**" nature of higher education activities, which no "**Other**" person could have done as well; and

WHEREAS, Dan was well loved by his HECB colleagues, who wish to point out that the key to a successful relationship with Dan was remembering is distaste for mornings and resulting preference not to conduct a conversation until noon; and

WHEREAS, Along with his expertise in fiscal matters Dan shared with his co-workers his love of chocolate and for his "Z" car; and

WHEREAS, Dan Keller has brought to the offices of the Higher Education Coordinating Board an unparalleled wit and charm that has contributed greatly to a positive working environment;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board extend its deepest gratitude to Dan Keller for his service to the Board and to the citizen of the state of Washington, and wish him all the best in this, his "second" retirement.

**Joint Meeting Between the Higher Education Coordinating  
Board and State Board for Community and Technical Colleges**  
**June 26, 2000**

*July 2000*

**HECB Members Present:**

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair  
Dr. Gay Selby, Vice Chair  
Mr. David Shaw, Secretary  
Ms. Kristianne Blake  
Mr. James Faulstich  
Mr. Larry Hanson  
Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins  
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn  
Ms. Patricia Stanford

**State Board Members Present:**

Ms. Connie Ambrose-Squeochs, Chair  
Mr. Bob Bavasi, Chair-Elect  
Mr. Al Link  
Mr. Tom Koenninger  
Mr. Barney Goltz  
Dr. Mark Kondo  
Ms. Jane Nishita  
Mr. Jose Ruiz

**BOARD INTRODUCTIONS**

Bob Craves, HECB Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and invited Board members to introduce themselves. He noted that the joint meeting was “somewhat historical” considering that the two boards and their staffs have not recently sat down at the same table to work together. Mr. Craves cited the effects of I-695 on funding for higher education and the need to “think through what we’re doing” in light of scarce resources. Bob Bavasi, incoming SBCTC Chair, introduced himself and expressed appreciation for the joint meeting.

**HECB OVERVIEW**

Following his introduction of HECB staff, executive director Marc Gaspard presented an overview of the Higher Education Coordinating Board, which included the duties and responsibilities of the Board as directed in statute, and major assignments. The HECB is directed by the Legislature to “*represent the broad public interest above the interests of the individual colleges and universities.*”

The HECB provides direct services to students through various financial aid programs, which comprise 95 percent of the agency budget. Key financial aid programs include the State Need Grant, State Work Study, Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG), Washington Scholars, and Washington Promise Scholarship. Most student financial aid programs serve low-income and/or at-risk students. Academic achievement is rewarded through the Washington Promise Scholarship and the Washington Scholars program.

Mr. Gaspard mentioned other direct student services such as the HECB’s long-standing commitment to displaced homemakers, and help for at-risk youth through GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs). Another HECB-administered program is the Guaranteed Education Tuition (GET), which enables families to prepay tuition at current rates.

The HECB is also charged with the development of the state's strategic plan for higher education (Master Plan), policy and budget analysis, and evaluation and authorization of degree programs. In addition, current legislative assignments are broadly categorized into studies, reports, and grants.

Bruce Botka, HECB Director for Governmental Relations, elaborated on current legislative assignments. Studies underway include those in the area of distance education, and the EOG program. Current grants are on information technology, teacher training, fund for innovation, and child care matching grants.

**High demand enrollments.** In 1999, the Legislature allocated 500 student FTEs to the HECB, to allocate to institutions that demonstrate high-demand program needs. Seventy percent or 350 of those FTEs will go to the community colleges, as well as the additional 50 FTEs allocated in the 2000 session. The 50 FTEs will be for computer training programs.

#### MASTER PLAN INITIATIVES

- **Enrollment and capital assumptions.** The Legislature's Master Plan Resolution (SCR 8425) directs the HECB to work with several organizations to reexamine Master Plan assumptions about capital needs and enrollment goals and options; to review the role of the two-year colleges in meeting enrollment needs; and to develop an enrollment accommodation plan. Working with a group of representatives from both four- and two-year institutions, a new approach to describing long-term enrollment needs and options has been developed and endorsed by the HECB. And in a similar work process, the HECB is continuing to refine its approach and priorities for the capital needs of the state's public higher education institutions.
- **Barriers to student success.** A comprehensive review is underway of rules that impede success and institutional competitiveness. A draft summary is being developed and will be presented for the HECB's consideration at its July meeting.
- **HELLO Network .** This will serve as a clearinghouse for education opportunities, including course offerings, funding information, and links to various sites on the web.

State Board member, Tom Koenninger, asked how the HECB made sure that there is sufficient student contact and feedback on its work. Marc Gaspard responded that there are ongoing stakeholder meetings and student outreach efforts. HECB meetings generally occur on college campuses and the Master Plan is a regular agenda item in all the meetings, with opportunity provided for public comment and/or student panel. To emphasize the collaborative nature of the HECB processes, Mr. Gaspard referred to a handout showing the various HECB work groups comprised of a broad range of representatives from Washington state communities, public agencies, higher education institutions (four- and two-year, public and independent), the SBCTC, the Council of Presidents, legislative staff, and the Office of Financial Management.

## SBCTC OVERVIEW

Earl Hale, SBCTC Executive Director, provided an introduction of the staff followed by an overview of the SBCTC, which is a governing board, unlike the HECB, which is a coordinating board. The SBCTC allocates funding and FTEs to the colleges.

Jan Yoshiwara, Director of the SBCTC's Educational Services Division, reviewed the agency's most recent vision and goals. The goals recently have been refined and streamlined through key system groups (SBCTC members, presidents, and trustees) as well as through a recent series of business and labor focus groups held around the state. The goals include the following:

1. Provide access to affordable higher education: a key component is the development of distance learning through online classes, which provides online access for time and placebound students.
2. Quality workforce education and training for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: businesses need technically-trained workers. The community and technical colleges are a major provider of high-demand, high-wage occupations.
3. Increase basic skills – including English-as-a-Second Language (ESL);
4. Provide quality academic transfer programs;
5. Enhance diversity of students and programs;
6. Improve student achievement; and
7. Ensure a first-class pool of faculty and staff.

## DISCUSSION

Mr. Shaw (HECB) asked about the rationale for Washington Online. Dr. Yoshiwara responded that it's a cooperative endeavor that all community colleges can participate in, as opposed to each community college having their own distance learning policies and curricula. Mr. Shaw asked if a combination approach has been looked at, where students take some classes on campus as well as distance learning coursework. She responded that many students are already doing that and it works well.

Dr. Selby (HECB) inquired if high school students would be able to take advantage of community college distance learning. Jan Yoshiwara responded that Running Start students, for example, could have the distance learning accessible to them, which would be determined through the initial screening process. Students are expected to have some computer literacy skills and knowledge including access to the Internet and an email account.

Another question arose as to where the online facility would be housed. There are several possibilities, including perhaps being housed at the SBCTC office, maybe having a competitive process for colleges who would want to host it; or maybe within the system's Center for Information Services (CIS), located in Redmond.

Mr. Bob Craves (HECB) wanted to know what would motivate teachers to provide online courses and how online programs are currently offered. There is a curriculum stipend available, but most of the motivation is driven by the faculty members who want to offer it; they find it new, challenging, exciting, and rewarding. Jan Yoshiwara suggested that the SBCTC could

make a presentation to the HECB at a future meeting, since a prepared presentation is available that gives a “mock-up” of online registration, and class participation and interaction.

Mr. Craves inquired about how the system is doing in the area of transfer. He indicated that he would like to see it be mandatory for the four-year institutions to accept two-year AA transfer degrees. Jan Yoshiwara said that our state has one of the best transfer /articulation models in the country, although we are still trying to improve in other areas. The system is offering an Associate of Science degree starting this fall and is also working on an education transfer degree. Additional work is needed in the area of vocational education transfer, where the tendency to attend college for a while, stop and return to work, and then return to college, is becoming the norm.

Mr. Larry Hanson (HECB) asked about remedial education and how that will play out with education reform. Mr. Earl Hale, SBCTC Executive Director, commented that education reform efforts would only affect those who are directly coming from high school, not the 60 percent who are returning students.

Dr. Chang Mook Sohn (HECB) asked if there was also movement from four-year to two-year institutions. Some students from the four-year colleges come to the community and technical colleges for continuing education in their same original field or for enrichment or specific job upgrading or information technology skills. This reinforces the importance of embracing the concept of lifelong learning.

Dr. Loretta Sepannen, Senior Research Manager, SBCTC, provided a system overview including student characteristics, mission areas, enrollment trends, and accountability. The system currently serves a diverse student body of 250,000. Many students involved in remedial education are older, returning adults. About 40 percent are students who have been out of high school for three years or less. Mr. Barney Goltz (SBCTC) added, “We don’t have the luxury of sending them back to high school.”

- Basic skills (unique to community colleges); ESL is big and growing. There has been a 32 percent growth in the past five years. The typical ESL student is about 31 years old; and one-third are taking at least one remedial class, mostly in math;
- Workforce – preparing for new jobs or upgrading job skills (largest percentage of community college students); some developmental programs (remediation) are usually needed; and
- Dr. Selby asked if data was available to compare community colleges to each other per region. Dr. Sepannen responded that this information is available on the SBCTC’s WEB page.

There is a 20 percent growth in high wage/high skill areas (7,400 students) with info tech leading, followed by apprenticeships. Most students’ college experience terminates with the acquisition of a certificate of program completion, in preparation for immediate employment. Dr. Selby asked what percent of information technology students go on to earn a Bachelor’s degree. This information is not yet available.

**Transfer preparation** – Currently there are 11,000 transfers each year but that number is expected to increase. It was noted that the word “transfer” might eventually be replaced with the term “mutual students,” which more accurately reflects the growing trend. To illustrate, students who might be taking the majority of classes at a four-year institution would also be taking a class or two at their local community or technical college (for example, during the summer).

Mr. Shaw asked about students who are coming back to the two-year college system for a change of career. The median age is 35; some are returning parents; some are coming back simply to upgrade their skills.

Dr. Selby asked what the projected need was going to be for the community colleges in the future. The response was that it was close to what the HECB had predicted in its Master Plan – about 25,000 FTE growth within the next ten years.

## SUMMARY

General conclusions from the SBCTC overview:

- General enrollment growth mirrors population growth;
- In addition, legislative policy changes are impacting enrollments, e.g. training dislocated workers, welfare reform, Running Start;
- Accountability efforts are well underway. The agency has numerous studies available on student progress/retention; placement and wages; transfer counts; students of color progress and success; worker retraining outcomes; and Workfirst outcomes. These reports can all be accessed through the agency’s website at [www.sbctc.ctc.edu/Pub/Pub.htm](http://www.sbctc.ctc.edu/Pub/Pub.htm).

Mr. Hale distributed a handout entitled “Meeting Students’ Goals and Public Expectations.”

## CAPITAL NEEDS

Mr. Gaspard gave an introduction into the broad capital and enrollment components of the 2000 Master Plan. Mr. Hanson said that the goal is to balance capital investments in projects that increase access with those that improve the quality of facilities and programs. He added that strong messages have come from the Legislature about the importance of an integrated priority process, and stressed the need for both Boards to be together in the eventual outcome.

Jim Reed, HECB Associate Director for capital planning, reviewed the need for budget guidelines that reflect the Board’s fiscal priorities. Key stakeholders have been meeting to address this issue, and to develop a set of policy-based factors upon to measure project priority. A draft set of factors was circulated and discussed, and input from the institutions is being sought to set the numeric values for scoring each of these different policy-based factors.

John Fricke, HECB Associate Director, spoke about the budget process and the various entities involved, beginning with the institutions, the SBCTC, the HECB, the Governor and the Legislature. With the limitations imposed by Initiative 601 and 695, and constricted resources, the Legislature desires to see an integrated budget request that takes into account the broad statewide policy perspectives relevant to setting higher education capital priorities.



Tom Koenninger asked if the plethora of all of the various higher education budget requests with a variety of priority lists has hindered understanding of overall higher education capital budget needs in the past. The informal answer was yes.

Mr. Hale reviewed the SBCTC's capital budget goals, divided into three main categories:

- Repair aging buildings (protect the state's investment);
- Modify facilities to fit new programs (particularly high demand and apprenticeships); and
- Increase capacity based on enrollment (based on changing demographics, economics, and basic skills).

Mr. Hale described as "collaborative" the system's process for prioritizing capital budget requests of its 34 colleges. Top projects are based on well-established, relevant criteria, and reviews performed by outside consultants. Colleges wait their turn due to limited resources; priority listing is carried forward from biennium to biennium. The drawback is that major projects can take between six to ten years from the planning stage through completion. Mr. Hale acknowledged that most of the capital growth in the system has been along the I-5 corridor.

Enrollment is rapidly outgrowing capacity, even though the system has been providing service through very intensive use of owned space and leasing. Online learning will help alleviate some of the system's capital needs and part of the gap, but SBCTC believes that demand will still outweigh capacity.

Members discussed various ideas to augment funding for capital needs. These discussions ranged from local bonding authority to statewide initiatives. Local bonding authority, in general, has not been considered a viable option due to its competition with local school district and other levies, etc. Community and technical colleges have formed their own local foundations which help immensely with alternative and supplemental funding.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Members of both boards expressed interest in meeting again. There being no further business, the joint State Board/HECB meeting of June 26, 2000 was adjourned at 12 noon.

## **EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM 2000 Program Review and Policy Study**

*July 2000*

### **BACKGROUND**

The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) periodically reviews policies and administrative procedures for the state-funded financial aid programs for which it has statutory responsibility. Such a study is currently underway for the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) program, which last underwent comprehensive review in 1994.

The Legislature established the EOG program in 1990 in response to a recommendation of the Higher Education Coordinating Board as one part of an overall strategy to increase upper-division enrollment. Other strategies included the establishment of branch campuses and lifting enrollment lids at public institutions. The program was based on the premise that the size, and therefore the construction and operating costs of the proposed branch campuses could be reduced if placebound students could be encouraged to enroll in existing colleges and universities and utilize what would be otherwise unused capacity.

The Board's 1994 review<sup>1</sup> notes that the EOG is designed to test the premise that a supplemental grant of some significance will affect student choice of institution. And the review points out that unlike most state-funded student aid programs, the EOG is driven from construction and enrollment policy rather than 'equity' or 'access' policy:

“...it represents a state policy attempt to influence institutional choice and thereby reduce the size and associated construction and operating costs of branch campus.”

**2000 HECB Study of the Educational Opportunity Grant.** The HECB has undertaken another review of the Educational Opportunity Grant. This program review and policy study will evaluate the program's effectiveness in responding to the goals established by the 1990 enabling legislation and determine whether current EOG program criteria are relevant in today's higher education environment. Work to date has focused primarily on statistical analyses of the extent to which the EOG program has positively influenced urban, placebound students to pursue upper-division coursework and persist toward baccalaureate degree completion. Staff will report initial findings at the July meeting.

The EOG study also will consider whether statutory modifications should be proposed, given the many changes that have occurred in higher education delivery since 1990, when the program was established. Policies that will be reviewed include the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> Chance, William (May 1994), *Educational Opportunity Grant Program Evaluation, for the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board*.

- whether the EOG program should continue to focus on serving urban, placebound students who reside in specified counties, or if eligibility should be extended to placebound students residing in any county;
- whether changes should be made in institutional eligibility;
- if grant amounts should be adjusted; and
- if other student eligibility criteria should be modified.

## **BOARD ACTION**

No Board action is required. Work on the EOG program review and policy analysis will continue throughout the summer, with a report submitted to the Board for consideration and possible action in September.

## **DISTANCE LEARNING STUDY**

### **(Engrossed House Bill 2952)**

### **Status Report**

*July 2000*

#### **BACKGROUND**

During the 2000 session of the state Legislature, lawmakers approved a bill directing the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to conduct a study of distance education. The bill, Engrossed House Bill (EHB) 2952, requests information to “facilitate more informed legislative decision-making about the role of distance education in serving the people of Washington.” The bill recognizes that the higher education environment in Washington is rapidly changing and that distance education opportunities and technologies will also continue to evolve.

EHB 2952 directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board to work in conjunction with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), Office of Financial Management (OFM), and the state institutions of higher education, and to deliver the study to the Legislature no later than January 2001.

**EHB 2952 Study Scope.** The bill describes a broad range of study topics, directing that the study complete the following:

- (1) Define the different modes of distance education;
- (2) Analyze the impact of distance education on capital needs and facility utilization;
- (3) Evaluate the impact of distance delivery on instruction and faculty, as well as student support, technological support, and administrative support services;
- (4) Identify obstacles in providing distance education instruction;
- (5) Analyze the cost factors associated with the various distance delivery modes;
- (6) Assess the role of the K-20 network in distance delivery;
- (7) Identify strategies to create efficiencies in distance delivery through inter-institutional partnerships and collaborations; and
- (8) Evaluate the implications of distance delivery on access to higher education.

The study requested by the Legislature is complex and far-reaching. The Board covered some aspects of the study during the research process for the 2000 Master Plan. Yet for some areas of the study, it is not clear whether quantitative data even exist yet. Many of the issues articulated in the study will overlap: e.g., the role of student services in quality instruction and the relationships between technology, facilities, and academic planning. HECB staff have attempted to be as inclusive as possible in the study process, requesting contacts and information from all parties at interest throughout the state higher education system, and including K-12 where appropriate.

The following people have been contacted to participate in the study to date:

**CWU**

David Kaufman, Asst. to the Provost for  
Learning Technologies

**COP**

Cindy Flynn, Associate Director

**EWU**

David Rand, Assoc. Vice Provost,  
Distance and Extended Programs  
Linda Kieffer, Professor, Computer  
Science

**Legislative Staff**

Erika Prager, House Higher Ed. Staff  
Jean Six, Senate Higher Ed. Staff  
Karen Barrett, Senate Ways & Means Staff

**OSPI**

David MacDonald, Dir. Interactive  
Technologies, OSPI

**SBCTC**

Suanne Carlson, Director, Distance  
Learning (co-lead on project)  
Mike Scroggins, Asst. Dir. Information  
and Technology  
Bill Moore, Mgr. Student Outcomes  
Connie Broughton, Dir., WA Online  
Ed Bachman, Dir. Distance Learning,  
Pierce College  
Mark Veljkov, Assoc. Dean, Distance  
Learning, Skagit Valley College

**TESC**

Bill Bruner, Library Director  
Steve Hunter, Institutional Research

**UW**

Dave Szatmary, UW Extension  
Louis Fox, Ed. Partnerships  
Caroline Maillard, Director, Higher Ed.  
Liaison  
Steve Kerr, Professor Ed. Technology  
William Zumeta, Professor, Ed. Policy

**WSU**

Jane Sherman, Associate Vice Provost,  
Academic Affairs  
Muriel Oaks, Associate Vice President,  
Extended University Affairs  
Janet Kendall, Extended Degree Program  
Janis Hall, Director, WHETS  
Mary Doyle Director, Information  
Technology  
Gary Brown, Center for Teaching and  
Learning Technologies  
Colleen Cook, Finance Officer  
Rob McDaniel, EUA Extension Liaison

**WWU**

Susanne James, Dir., Credit Programs,  
Western Extended Programs  
Larry Gilbert, Dir. Academic Technology

Institutional response has been extremely positive and cooperative. This is an area of widespread interest, and one in which each institution has taken a different approach. It will be important to represent accurately the distinctions among the institutions' approaches to e-learning, as well as to synthesize the areas where thinking as a system will be helpful.

Distance learning challenges many of the existing systems and structures in higher education. The report required by EHB 2952 is an opportunity to explore those challenges and build a conceptual framework to help policymakers understand them. This study provides an excellent opportunity to discuss and identify new solutions, taking advantage of the creative thinking of the best minds in Washington State education.

## STUDY STRATEGIES

HECB staff have worked with representatives of the SBCTC, baccalaureates, and legislative staff to review the legislative intent and develop a detailed outline for the report. The draft outline has been circulated several times for revisions and further refinement. HECB staff have discussed the study outline with legislative staff. They in turn have met with legislators to review the HECB outline and assure the study scope will meet their needs.

**Participation of baccalaureate institutions.** Representatives from the baccalaureate institutions, who have primary responsibilities in the area of distance education, have been asked to be responsible for the following work:

- Review and revise the outline
- Provide existing reports and studies that might inform the content of the study
- Share relevant case studies
- Provide data where needed
- Review the draft content

Key individuals involved in managing distance education programs are submitting written materials for elements of the report to be reviewed by their peers. There will be several reviews and revisions before the report is submitted to the Board and the Legislature.

**Literature review.** Several key areas have been identified for literature reviews. These include impact on faculty, outcomes assessment, impact on instruction, and the role of e-commerce in changing student expectations. The literature reviews are being conducted with help from graduate students from the University of Washington Educational Technology program. Community college faculty are drafting sections on faculty issues. This content will be backed up with citations from existing studies and literature.

In addition, Zane Berge, a leading distance education researcher, recently conducted a survey on barriers to distance education. His survey instrument was based on a broad review of existing literature. Berge has given the HECB permission to administer a statewide version the survey so we can compare the barriers identified in Washington State to Berge's more general findings.

In addition to all of this, HECB and SBCTC staff plan to coordinate a series of discussion sessions on specific topics among key people in the institutions. Findings regarding the status

of costing methods, learning and access centers, use of the K-20 network, facilities and infrastructure planning will be verified through this process.

Once the draft materials are assembled, HECB and SBCTC staff members with specific expertise – for example, in the areas of capital planning, financial aid, costing and technology – will review and analyze the institutional submissions and statements.

<b>DISTANCE LEARNING REPORT TIMELINE</b>	
<i>Activity</i>	<i>Date</i>
Outline drafted, revised and approved	July 15
Initial writing, institutional submissions and review	August 1
Gap Analysis and Forum Development	September 1
Draft to institutions for review/revision	October 1
Preliminary Presentation to HECB	October 26
Final Approval	December

## **PARTICIPATION OF PEOPLE OF COLOR IN HIGHER EDUCATION Recommendations for Monitoring and Reporting**

*July 2000*

### **BACKGROUND**

State law charges the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) with various responsibilities regarding participation of people of color in higher education. Specifically, statute [28B.80.350 (11)] directs the HECB to “[m]ake recommendations to increase minority<sup>1</sup> participation, and monitor and report on the progress of minority participation in higher education.” In March 1996, the Board adopted 20 statewide diversity goals (Resolution No. 96-06). The goals included quantitative measures on minority student enrollment, retention, and completion, and faculty and staff employment. They also included less quantifiable measures related to “institutional climate.”

The HECB has periodically submitted progress reports on minority participation; the most recent was reviewed by the Board at their meeting in December 1999. In addition to approving the report, the resolution (99-46) included several statements by the Board: reaffirmation of its commitment to the value of ethnic and racial diversity; a directive to conduct a review (in collaboration with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and public baccalaureate institutions) of the statewide goals for participation of people of color by September 2000; and a directive that the HECB continue to monitor participation of people of color in higher education, specifically in the areas of student enrollment, retention, completions and institutional climate.

### **2000 DIVERSITY POLICY REVIEW**

**Input from External Review Groups.** Based on the Board resolution, HECB convened two external groups – a working group and a leadership group -- to help review the various issues, and formulate suggestions for the future direction of HECB’s diversity initiative. Altogether, 30 individuals from higher education institutions, from other state agencies, and several from non-state entities accepted the invitation to participate in the review effort. The HECB involvement included at least six staff members who worked on various aspects of the review.

**The Working Group** included people with day-to-day experience working with students and an “on-the-ground” knowledge of what makes students of color successful in college. The work group represented historical and current knowledge, and understanding of the issues of the participation of racial/ethnic minorities in higher education and the workforce. The work group was charged with advising the HECB how better to fulfill their legislative mandate of monitoring and reporting on minority participation in higher education, and recommending strategies to increase minority participation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this report, the term “minority” will refer to people of color. Although the term “diversity” can be applied in several areas, this report focuses on diversity as related to race/ethnicity.



**Working Group membership:**

UW: Christopher Knaus, Enrique Morales, Tim Washburn  
 WSU: Victor Villanueva  
 CWU: Michael Reilly  
 EWU: William Ponder  
 TESC: Diane Kahaumia, Carol Minugh, Jesse Welch  
 WWU: Rafael Gomez  
 SU: Kimberly Johnson  
 UPS: Kim Bobby  
 Edmonds CC: Kayleen Oka  
 Everett CC: Christina Castorena  
 Olympic CC: Mona Pitre

K-12: Ron Washington, Ichelium School District; Doris McEwen Walker, Edmonds School District  
 The Boeing Company: Tavo Quevedo, Fluor Daniel  
 Hanford, Inc.: Theresa Quezada  
 Yakima Farmworkers Clinic: Vickie Ybarra  
 HECB: Evelyn Hawkins (Lead), John McLain, Patty Mosqueda, Doug Scrima, Linda Schactler

**The Leadership Group** was comprised of individuals who were appointed by public baccalaureates, COP, SBCTC, OSPI, and WAICU to articulate leadership issues and priorities regarding diversity:

**Leadership Group membership:**

UW:	Myron Apilado	COP	Cynthia Flynn
WSU:	Ernestine Madison	SBCTC:	Rhonda Coats
CWU:	Nancy Howard	WAICU:	Laura Majovski (PLU)
EWU:	Laurie Connelly	HECB:	Evelyn Hawkins (lead),
WWU:	Kunle Ojikutu		Linda Schactler, Becki
TESC:	Art Costantino		Collins
OSPI:	Andrew Griffin		

**Factors affecting the current environment surrounding discussions of diversity.** Before describing the activities of the groups, it should be noted that several developments, nationally and specific to Washington State, have changed the environment for diversity initiatives. Recent developments have both animated and complicated research and program delivery regarding minority participation in higher education. Some of these include the passage of I-200, changes in census data gathering, rapid population increases among certain ethnic groups in Washington State, and increasing distance between the wealthy and the poor. Two of these have immediate impact.

**Effects of I-200:** The 1999 HECB diversity study was undertaken less than a year after Washington voters approved Initiative 200, described in statute [RCW 49.60.400-401] as follows:

*The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.*

I-200 has received considerable attention, particularly in its relation to admissions policies of colleges and universities.

**Race/Ethnic Categories:** Changes in race/ethnic reporting categories mandated by the U.S. Congress beginning with the 2000 Census will impact reporting of racial/ethnic data in the State of Washington. (The question on race for Census 2000 was modified to be consistent with the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) revised standards.) There were some changes in specific race/ethnic categories, but the most far-reaching change involves the ability of individuals to designate more than one category. Existing historical data allowed only one race/ethnic category per person. Clearly, the 2000 Census approach to gathering data provides a richer, more detailed perspective on the race and ethnicity of citizens. At the same time it complicates the way this data will be analyzed and integrated with other databases, as well as comparisons of race/ethnic data across time.

**Activities of the Review Groups.** Because of the short timeline, the Working Group met on two occasions (April 17 and May 18); the Leadership Group met once on April 27<sup>th</sup>. The principal task for the groups was to review the existing statewide goals, and to suggest how the HECB could more effectively fulfill its legislative mandate to increase participation of people of color.

**General Discussion -- Information to assess the current environment for students of color:** HECB staff initiated discussions with the Working Group by focusing on the question, "what do stakeholders need to know to better understand and to enhance the participation of people of color in higher education?" During the first meeting, members suggested a wide range of information that they felt would be essential to truly understand the participation of people of color in higher education. It included not only student progress after admission to higher education, but a substantial amount of pre-college information. That is, the group recognized that enhancing minority participation in higher education requires better preparation for college, both academic and financial. And this preparation starts when the student/child is very young. Specifically, the group identified areas of desired information; the following delineates these areas along with the types of questions that would elicit relevant information:

**Student and family aspirations:**

- What do parents want for their children's futures?
- What do students think about higher education; do they understand its purposes and relevance to their lives?
- What are students' perceptions about requirements/ procedures for getting into higher education?

**Inclusive teaching and learning in K-12 education:**

- Do K-12 teachers perceive higher education as attainable for their students?
- Is the K-12 curriculum inclusive – does it lead to full participation of all students?
- Do all students have access to "gatekeeper" courses (e.g., algebra and geometry)?
- Is the K-12 curriculum culturally relevant? Is it culturally relevant in all aspects, learning styles through life experiences -- or is "culture" relegated to a unit or project?

**Preparation for college:**

- What is the level of K-12 minority student participation in college preparation?
- What is the caliber of college-prep courses?

- Are K-12 resources available to all students, or are there disparities: for example, is there equitable access to technology training and equipment?

**College Admission:**

- Are admission requirements truly reflective of students' abilities? Are there barriers to college admission that tend to exclude some students, particularly minority applicants?

**What works at the college level:**

- What types of efforts -- such as outreach, retention, and student support services -- lead to successful enrollment and performance of minority students?
- In addition to initial enrollment, what facilitates the process of transferring from one institution to another (particularly two-year to four-year transfer)?

**Institutional support at the college level:**

- What are educators' levels of commitment to minority participation? Is adequate financial aid available to students of color?
- How do faculty and staff interact with students of color?
- What is the participation level of faculty and staff of color in the institution, and by discipline?

**Student outcomes:**

- How do students of color perform? Do they progress in their education at a rate commensurate with the general population of students? Is their progression affected by unmet need for financial aid?
- When students leave the educational system, is exit data collected that would inform educators/administrators about what works and doesn't work?
- Does higher education adequately prepare students to participate in the workforce and be economically successful?

**Metrics and analysis:**

- An over-arching concern is the need for adequate information to monitor and evaluate the level of participation in higher education. This is needed for the entire population of students, and, in particular, adequate data is needed to examine participation of students of color. Questions to be explored include:
- Who is attending, and who is not attending?
- What are the indications of K-12 preparation related to race/ethnic minorities, such as:
- test scores, types of pedagogy experienced by students, advanced placement course-taking, "tracking" experiences of students, high school graduates by race/ethnicity, economic profile of students.
- What data are needed related to higher education experiences? What types of data already exist, and what more is needed? What qualitative data, in addition to quantitative data, should be collected?
- What are the limitations surrounding data collection and analysis -- such as constraints due to privacy and use of social security numbers?

Information in the areas discussed above would improve the understanding of how students of color currently fare at various levels of the education system. Although data in all areas are not

available, the Working Group generally agreed that more information would greatly enhance the possibility of finding problem areas, and lead to the creation of appropriate solutions

**General Discussion: strategies for increasing minority participation.**

The Working Group's second meeting added another dimension. While the first meeting focused on information needs, the second discussion examined strategies to overcome problems which are likely to surface – especially when adequate information is available. This discussion directly addressed the HECB's legislative mandate to “recommend strategies to increase minority participation.”

There was considerable discussion that HECB could expand its role beyond that of publishing reports. These suggested strategies involve HECB in information gathering, but also include HECB as an active participant in the implementation of selected strategies. For example, HECB might convene forums, conduct research, or support additional funding for diversity. The following are some suggestions for enhancing the participation of people of color. The short time period during which both the Working Group and Leadership Group conducted its meetings did not allow enough time to examine any suggestions in depth. However, these are the types of strategies that could be considered in future discussions.

**Faculty mentoring strategies:**

Support efforts to “grow our own,” that is, to mentor current faculty and staff for promotion within the state's higher education system and encourage the hiring of recent or soon-to-be graduates for faculty and staff positions.

**Enhance K-12 preparation of students of color:**

Conduct research on preparation for higher education, including an eligibility study, which would examine core-course taking behavior of secondary-school students.

**Improve institutions' multicultural “climate”:**

Conduct institutional climate studies including one that relates climate to retention and completion.

**Provide leadership on diversity:**

Lead research, discussion, and strategic thinking on enhancing diversity on college campuses, and specifically the participation of people of color in higher education.

The above list highlights some of the strategies discussed. In general, these strategies would help elicit “best practices,” but the suggestions also include an active role for HECB to initiate and/or support various activities.

The Leadership Group met subsequent to the first meeting of the Working Group. Their discussions echoed many of the issues and concerns described above, including the need for better information as well as resources to implement effective strategies.

**Recommendations: Revision of statewide goals / continued monitoring of participation.**

The following describes the consolidated recommendations of both the Working Group and Leadership Group – based on discussions and feedback to date. Major aspects of the project require further analysis and discussion, and included is a recommendation to continue this effort. In general, however, *the advisory groups agreed that the HECB should continue to set goals for minority participation in higher education, but that these goals must be changed.*

In addition, while the process of revising goals moves forward, *ongoing reporting and monitoring of various elements of participation should continue.* Following is a listing of recommendations from the groups.

**1. Suspend the current goals, and continue to work toward a revised set of goals.**

The goals are important, but monitoring of the goals, per se, should be suspended at least temporarily. The HECB, along with the advisory groups, should continue to review and revise the existing goals to assure that meaningful information will be available regarding the participation of people of color in higher education.

**2. Continue to monitor minority participation rates — independent of goals.**

The HECB should continue to collect data on enrollment, retention, completion, and institutional climate. In addition, information should be requested and compiled on what types of programs are being proposed or implemented, not to determine whether an institution has achieved a goal number, but in order to inform policy. For example, data on enrollment from 1999-2000 and subsequent years, coupled with information on programs and initiatives at the colleges, would help to correlate information on enrollment (and enrollment trends) with various types of programmatic efforts at the campuses.

**3. Include analysis with “monitoring” function.** The work group agreed that past HECB reports provided data related to the participation goals, but lacked critical analyses of the findings. Both the Working Group and Leadership Group felt that without analysis — including suggestions for improvement — the diversity reports are not as meaningful or effective as they could be. This concern should be addressed in future reports.

**4. Maintain the advisory groups.** The HECB should continue to work with the advisory groups. Members of the groups may change – depending on availability. It is important that HECB continue to seek input from those who have contact with students of color — grades K through 16 — to establish new goals, and to expand the scope of the effort if needed. This continuation of the diversity initiative should be guided by the work that has already been done during spring 2000 by the Working Group and the Leadership Group.

## **NEXT STEPS**

**1. Convene the advisory group(s) to continue the following:**

- a) Review and revise the goals;
- b) Analyze and recommend suggested strategies (in conformance with the statutory directive).

**2. Initiate data collection from the institutions for the 1999-2000 academic year** on enrollment, retention, completion, transfer, and institutional climate. Data in the December 1999

report extended only to 1998. It is important to collect data for 1999-2000 is important so that continuity is maintained and trends can be identified. And perhaps more significant, data collected for 1999-2000 (beginning in fall 1999) is the first year following the passage of I-200. Furthermore, at least some institutions have begun to implement changes in race/ethnic reporting categories—including the multi-race option; it is important to monitor these changes in data structure.

Although HECB will not issue a formal diversity report in the current year, data collection needs to continue so that year-to-year data (without interruptions) will be available for the next report.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-22**

WHEREAS, RCW 28B.80.350 (11) requires the Higher Education Coordinating Board to monitor and report on minority participation in higher education, and to make recommendations to increase minority participation; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted Resolution No. 99-46, approving the Diversity and Participation of People of Color in Higher Education: 1999 Report; and in addition, directed further review of the statewide goals for participation of people of color with a report by September 2000, and directed continued monitoring of participation of people of color in higher education (specifically in student enrollment, retention, completions, and institutional climate); and

WHEREAS, The staff of the Higher Education Coordinating Board convened two advisory groups and began review during spring 2000 of goals and strategies related to participation of people of color in higher education; and

WHEREAS, The advisory groups have discussed issues and made initial recommendations regarding goals, monitoring, and continued study;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board suspend implementation of the existing goals regarding participation of people of color in higher education which was directed by Resolution No. 96-06 of the Higher Education Coordinating Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board postpone until 2001 the next formal report on participation of people of color in higher education; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board maintain annual data collection related to participation of people of color in higher education in the areas of student enrollment, retention, transfer, completions, and institutional climate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board continue to convene advisory groups to further review goals and strategies related to participation of people of color in higher education. By July 2001, recommendations on goals and strategies should be presented to the Board.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

## **2001-2003 DRAFT HECB BUDGET REQUEST**

*July 2000*

### **BACKGROUND**

The Higher Education Coordinating Board is a nine-member citizen board, directed in statute “...to represent the broad public interest above the individual interests of the institutions” [RCW 28B.80.320]. The Higher Education Coordinating Board administers all state-funded financial aid so that grants and work study — state and federal — may be coordinated to provide the best possible service to students and ensure the best use of state resources. The Board also provides policy, regulatory, and fiscal recommendations at the request of the Legislature and governor.

More than one-half of the agency’s 75-FTE workforce is dedicated to administering a statewide program of comprehensive student financial aid. About 14 staff perform policy development and fiscal analysis for the Legislature and Governor. Other staff provide 1.) direct student services (e.g. Displaced Homemaker and GEAR UP programs), 2.) “consumer protection” services (e.g. Degree Authorization Act and VA State Approving Agency), and 3.) agency support (e.g. personnel, information technology support). Every four years, the HECB prepares a strategic plan for higher education, which, once adopted by the Legislature, becomes the state’s higher education policy. The HECB issued its most recent master plan in January 2000.

**Master Plan Provides the Foundation for Agency Budget Request.** The 2000 Master Plan for Higher Education sets out policy goals and operational and financing strategies for higher education in Washington State through 2010. The overall theme of that plan is to provide a high quality education that meets the changing needs of students. This student-centered focus must recognize and accommodate the growing population of college-age students and lifelong learners expected to seek educational opportunity in the future. The development of the HECB agency budget request is founded on the goals of the Master Plan, specifically, those within the immediate jurisdiction of HECB operations: student financial aid, policy research, enrollment planning, development of competency-based admissions and degree programs, capital planning, and other direct student services.

The current spending authority for the Higher Education Coordinating Board (1999-01, state general fund) is \$241 million; 93 percent of that appropriation is earmarked for student aid/direct services. The HECB current level of service “carried forward” into the next biennium is calculated by OFM at about \$247 million. Proposed enhancements for the 2001-03 biennium total \$75 million, an increase of 30 percent. The majority of the increase — about \$58 million — is in student aid/direct services enhancements.

The state budget office, the Office of Financial Management, performs the first review of agency budget requests, and has directed state agencies to submit budget requests by September 5, 2000. Following are the proposed HECB budget “decision packages” for the 2001-03 biennial budget



period. These proposals reflect discussion and preliminary decisions of the Board's Fiscal Subcommittee, which met on June 20.<sup>1</sup>

### **BOARD ACTION REQUESTED**

The Board is requested to adopt the following draft 2001-03 budget request. With the adoption by the full Board, by September 5 these proposals will be refined and drafted to accommodate OFM submittal requirements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Board members in attendance at the meeting included Bob Craves, Gay Selby, Chang Mook Sohn, and Jim Faulstich.

## HECB 2001-03 BUDGET REQUEST

### 1. Enhance Student Financial Assistance -- \$57.3 million<sup>2</sup> total request

Research indicates that financial aid awards, comprised of adequate grant assistance and a reasonable amount of work study and loans, are most likely to improve persistence and success among financially needy students. Nearly one in six Washington students – or about 55,000 people – receives some form of direct state aid.

Without alternatives to borrowing, the promise of financial aid “leveling the playing field” between needy and non-needy college students is broken. Low-income individuals, fearful of assuming large levels of debt, may not attend. Those who do pursue a college education often must assume large levels of student debt, which can postpone the college graduate’s decision to start a family, purchase a home and participate fully in the social and economic benefits associated with a higher education.

**A. State Need Grant - \$39.8 million in 2001-03** to fund tuition-based awards for all eligible students whose family incomes are at or below 75 percent of the state median family income. The anticipated grant amount will reduce by 50 percent the gap between the current award and full tuition and fees at public colleges and universities.

**The Challenge.** State Need Grants help 51,000 (FTE) of the state’s lowest-income students go to college every year. To be eligible under current guidelines, a student’s family income must be equal to or less than 65 percent of the state median family income, or about \$37,500 for a family of four. In addition, current grants, which range from about \$1,600 to \$2,900, cover only a portion of tuition and fees, forcing students to increasingly turn to loans.

**HECB Request.** The Board’s highest budget priority has been to serve more students through increased state funding for the State Need Grant program. A \$39.8 million increase would allow the Board to do the following:

- 1). expand eligibility to students whose family incomes are equal to or less than 75 percent of the state’s median family income, or about \$43,000 for a family of four; and
- 2). reduce by 50 percent the gap between current grants and the cost of tuition and fees.

**Results.** The new funding would allow the state’s lowest-income students to rely less on loans to pay for college and would help an additional 3,500 (FTE) of the state’s lowest- income students go to college.

In 1998 the Board approved, and in 1999 the Legislature endorsed, a shift in the funding model from grants equal to a percentage of the “total cost-of-attendance” to grants equal to the value of tuition and fees at the state’s public colleges and universities. This change resulted in a gap of a

---

<sup>2</sup> Budget request numbers are rounded for the purposes of this discussion document.

few dollars at the community and technical colleges, and about \$1,600 per student at the public research universities. The Board seeks to close this award “gap” by 50 percent.

The \$39.8 million cost assumes a four-percent annual increase in public-sector tuition charges<sup>3</sup>, but *does not assume any increase in funded FTEs, or in the enrollment of eligible needy students.*

<b>Value of Tuition-based Awards (\$) – Close Current Gap By 50%</b> (assumes 4% increase in tuition per year):			
SECTOR	Current 2000-01	2001-2002	2002-2003
Research	2313	3099	3223
Comprehensive	2071	2557	2659
Independent four-year	2908	3408	3544
CTC	1632	1702	1770
Independent Vocational	1632	1702	1770

<b>Costs To Achieve 50% Tuition Award &amp; Serve Up To 75% of Median Family Income</b>		
	<b>2001-2002</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>
<b>Annual Cost @ 50% Tuition Award</b>	\$103,800,000	\$108,000,000
Current Level	\$86,000,000	\$86,000,000
Additional Needed for Full Tuition Award	\$17,800,000	\$22,000,000
Total Needed For 2001-2003 Biennium	---	\$39,800,000

**B. State Work Study - \$7.5 million** to assist 2,000 additional students in achieving their education goals.  
(1 FTE)

**The Challenge.** Financially needy students need an alternative to high levels of borrowing and the opportunity to earn a portion of their educational expenses. At the same time, employers report that college graduates often lack “real world” work experience. This lack of workplace skills results in additional costs to many employers, who expect these skills to accompany the “package” when they employ a college graduate. Consequently, employers must invest further in basic work readiness training, causing them to question the return on investment for their general tax support to higher education. (Elway, 1999)

<sup>3</sup> Tuition increases throughout this document are calculated at the anticipated rate of increase of per capita personal income during the 2001-03 biennium (between 4% and 4.1 %), as recommended in the 2000 Master Plan.

**HECB Request.** State Work Study helps financially needy students earn money for college while gaining experience in areas related to their degrees or career interests, whenever possible.

**Results.** An additional 2,000 Washington students will be able to borrow less as they pay for the education, and gain valuable career and job skills. And because employers and the state share the cost of student wages, the state is able to more effectively leverage its funds. Employers receive well-educated workers at a lower cost and the opportunity to preview talent for future permanent hire. And State Work Study students who go to work immediately upon graduation are able to make a quicker return on taxpayers' investment.

The program currently serves about 9,500 students each year with the State contributing a about \$15 million and employers contributing about \$6 million. With the requested increase, the program would be able to serve more than 11,500 students at slightly higher levels.

Specifically, an additional \$7.5 million in funding would allow the State Work Study program to do the following:

1. serve 2,000 more financially needy students annually;
2. increase the state share of the student wages, on average, from \$1,675 to \$1,825 per student;
3. increase commitments for GEAR-UP tutors; and
4. create strong placements in off-campus, community service and economic development sectors; and
5. generate an additional \$1.5 million in employer contributions.

Although increases to the program carry an additional administrative burden for colleges, this request is at a level schools indicate they can absorb with assistance from the HECB.

**C. Washington Promise Scholarship - \$10.0 million** to fully fund awards for all eligible students.

**The Challenge.** Funding for the merit- and need-based Washington Promise Scholarship was not adequate to fund full awards to all eligible students. The Washington Promise Scholarship currently exists only in budget language; the HECB has recommended its authorization in statute to ensure continued support for academic excellence.

**HECB Request.** The HECB supported the creation of the Washington Promise Scholarship program in 1999 and has urged the Legislature to establish the program in law. The \$9.991 million funding request would allow the HECB to provide awards to low- and middle-income students in recognition of their superior academic achievements in high school. The maximum value of the award would be equal to community college tuition and fees. Students would be able to use the scholarships for two consecutive years following high school graduation, at any accredited public and independent colleges, university, and career training school in the State of Washington.

**Results.** More than 15,000 top-performing low- and middle-income Washington students would receive help toward their college tuition.

The program's estimated cost is based on the bill considered by the Legislature in the 2000 session. That measure recognized as eligible all students graduating in the top 15 percent of their high school class, as well as all 10<sup>th</sup> grade students who successfully pass the state Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) on their first attempt. The WASL test-takers likely will begin taking the test in the spring of 2001, and begin using the award in fall 2003.

Fiscal Year	Annual Awards			Grant Amount - based on CC tuition (increased by PCPI)	Total Cost	Current Level	Additional Needed
	Renewals from prior year	New Awards	Total awards				
2001-2002	3,731	3,450	7,182	1,707	\$12,259,674	\$8,300,000	\$3,959,674
2002-2003	4,529	3,545	8,074	1,775	\$14,331,350	8,300,000	\$6,031,350
Total	----	----	----	----	\$26,591,024	\$16,600,000	\$9,991,024

## **2. “Digital Government” Initiative -- \$3.2 million total request**

Nearly 93 percent of the HECB agency budget is comprised of student financial aid. Information requests to the Board — its Web site, telephone hotline, and mail — come primarily from students and families. The HECB continually seeks new ways to make information available and understandable to customers, and to improve service to citizens.

In accordance with the Governor's Digital Government initiative, the HECB has identified several strategies to use electronic technology to make higher education programs and information more insightful, accessible, and user-friendly.

<p><b>A. Higher Education Lifelong Learning Network – \$1.3 million</b> (est.) to provide immediate, user-friendly information and resources to citizens, particularly those in under-served communities.</p> <p>(1 FTE)</p>
--

**The Challenge.** College information is available on thousands of Web sites and brochures — for those who have the experiences and skills to explore and interpret our complicated system of

higher education. For those who are first in their family to go to college, struggling to make ends meet, or live in rural areas of our state, navigating and accessing the higher education system is daunting, if not impossible.

**HECB Request.** The *2000 Master Plan for Higher Education: The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner*, approved by the Legislature in 2000, proposes the creation of the HELLO Network, to achieve the following student-centered ends:

- **reach out to people historically under-represented in higher education** to inform them of the benefits of higher education, the academic requirements and financial assistance available to go college;
- **provide college-bound audiences with information** about financial aid, admissions, transfers, and education services and requirements;
- **marshal education services in rural communities**, bringing together all available higher education and community resources — *public and private* — to meet citizens' education needs; and,
- **guide citizens** through the on-line courses and programs available through a web-based, inter-institutional database of on-line courses, programs, and student services.

**Phase one: creating a student friendly website.** In this phase (spring 2000-spring 2002), the HECB will create a Web site that will include a one-stop, interactive, multi-cultural information source about higher education, interactive degree auditing, and a catalogue of on-line education opportunities. The HECB has begun implementation of phase one, developing graphic presentation elements for Web-based and hard copy information for a diverse audience. Initial funding has come through agency reprioritization of resources and a partnership with the GEAR-UP program.

Phase one also will include technical feasibility studies and budgeting, staff and human resource development, and full-scale scoping of the project including transition/ integration with GEAR-UP.

**Phase two: promoting higher education access in rural areas.** This phase (spring 2002 - 2003) will include coordinating information and support for education resources in under-served communities. The Board's 1999 Rural Areas Study identified several strategies to serve rural areas of Washington State. This study should be "mined" for community outreach aspects of the HELLO Network, which will be realized in Phase two. In the meantime, recent legislation to promote access in rural areas (1997-99 biennium) included \$500,000 in the current operating budget for a demonstration project in Jefferson County. The goal of the project was to improve rural access to higher education through distance learning. This successful project will be entering its critical second phase during the 2001-03 biennium; a **\$400,000 enhancement will allow the project to continue.**

<p><b>B. Reduce Barriers to Student Transfer and Articulation - \$300,000 one-time funding</b> to implement "CAS," an interactive technology at baccalaureate institutions that lets students immediately see how their courses fulfill degree requirements at desired schools.</p>
---

**The Challenge.** More than 27 percent of students attend academic programs at state community colleges with the goal of transferring to public baccalaureate schools. However, each public four-year has different course requirements for its programs. Consequently, students become frustrated and often take classes that they later discover are not transferable to their desired schools, wasting both their time and public resources.

**HECB Request.** Using the Course Applicability System, or “CAS,” students will be able to view the degree program requirements at all Washington public four-year schools, enter the courses they have taken or would like to take, and immediately see whether the courses will fulfill degree requirements at their desired schools.

**Results.** The investment in CAS will help students move more quickly and efficiently through the state’s higher education system. The CAS technology, combined with other higher education initiatives, is expected to reduce students’ time-to-degree while increasing graduation and transfer rates.

A state system-wide standard will allow students to quickly and easily compare schools and decide which one is most suitable for them. Other states, including Ohio, Arizona, and Minnesota, are using this software to help transfer students move between schools and to earn degrees in a more timely manner. Costs to implement this service to students include initial system licensing, annual maintenance costs, and startup costs for software & training.

**C. Integrate and update public higher education data and technology systems - \$1.6 million** one-time appropriation to increase the accuracy and speed of HECB service to Washington citizens, the Governor, and the Legislature. (1 FTE)

**The Challenge.** The HECB is the primary higher education research arm of the Office of the Governor and the Legislature. In addition, the HECB is a system-wide coordinator of several significant databases, including the (financial aid) Unit Record Report and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, a federal program and enrollment database. Yet, outdated systems and often incompatible databases often make it difficult to effectively serve HECB customers, including citizens, the Governor, and the Legislature.

**HECB Request.** The following steps would improve the speed, depth, and accuracy with which the HECB could complete research in a variety of higher education issue areas. The result of better research, in turn, would be an improved higher education environment for students.

**1. Integrate, unify, and interrelate system data for research and analysis.** Higher education data currently exists in several discrete, often incompatible databases: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS), Public Central Higher Education Enrollment System (PCHEES), Higher Education Enrollment Report (HEER), Unit Record Report (URR). Unifying and standardizing data systems will give HECB research staff immediate access to the data they need to complete legislative and executive research projects.

**2. MRTE: improving transfer info./articulation.** The HECB can help ensure that students are proceeding successfully along the state's many "learning pathways" by supporting a new data-sharing system between two- and four-year colleges. The University of Washington and the SBCTC have pioneered the "Mutual Transcript Research Enterprise" (MTRE) under a grant from the Fund for Innovation. The intent of the project was to establish a mechanism to assess how well community college students are prepared for baccalaureate work.

Until now, this research was impeded because institutions maintained separate student-data systems and because of issues surrounding student privacy. MRTE creates a mechanism through which a third party (contractor) is able to mask personal identifiers and collect aggregated information. The system benefits the state by improving graduation rates and efficiency, while preserving student confidentiality. This proposal seeks to broaden the pilot project to full participation among higher education institutions in the state.

**3. Upgrade HECB Web site.** The HECB launched a Web site two years ago to enhance access to information about higher education: from information about student aid to access to agency research. Development of the site was funded from internal reallocation of resources. The site should be upgraded to be more user-friendly and interactive. Other Web upgrades would allow the HECB to automate online processes and set up security systems for financial aid, personnel, and internal transactions.

**4. Database Development.** By reallocating internal resources over the last four years, the agency has reorganized and stabilized key databases, reprogramming them and housing them on the mainframe computer of the Department of Information Services. These data are used for a number of activities that are critical to HECB customers, citizens, the Governor, and the Legislature:

- the efficient and accountable administration of approximately \$225 million in state-funded student financial aid;
- postsecondary education research, which serves as the foundation of higher education public policy in Washington State.

**IT Challenges: user-friendly databases, update legacy systems.** There are still three major database development projects before the HECB, which will require significant investment to achieve. While the HECB continues to make investment in information technology a priority, significant programming and architecture advancements in the IT environment require a "jump-start" infusion of funding to be realized.

Some HECB databases have not been rewritten from old systems based on undocumented, and outdated programming. If such a program "breaks," it is difficult and may not even be possible to fix because the company that supported the programming language no longer exists and the programming language is encrypted or undocumented. The HECB intends to convert these "legacy" systems and data to more modern relational database systems, which are more accessible and more compatible with the HECB windows environment.



### **3. Enhance Student Access and Instructional Capacity -- \$12.2 million total request**

**A. Enrollment accommodation pool - \$4.3 million in 2001-03** for 500 student FTE to enhance system efficiency and student access.

**The Challenge.** Anticipating how many students will attend public colleges and universities each fall is an imprecise science. Even more difficult is anticipating *where* students will enroll, and what credit-load they will shoulder. Inevitably, slight variations from targeted enrollment (funding) levels occur systemwide; currently the only recourse to correct imbalances in the system is the formal state budget process.

**HECB Request.** In 1999-01 the HECB requested funding for an enrollment pool to even out the “bumps” in enrollment distribution in the state. In the Master Plan the HECB proposed an enrollment accommodation plan, which the Legislature subsequently directed the HECB to create. This request is for 500 FTE to help the state accommodate enrollment distribution and fully utilize available resource.

**Result.** The result of implementing an enrollment accommodation pool would be better use of state resources — enrollment and capital — statewide, and a quicker, more flexible response to the ebb and flow of enrollment levels at each institution.

**B. High-demand enrollment and grant programs - \$7.9 million in 2001-03** to enhance high-demand program capacity and student services, and encourage innovation in postsecondary education. (1 FTE)

**The Challenge.** The growth of workers’ skills and the number of trained workers have not kept pace with the employment needs of our state’s booming economy. K-12 teachers and information technology specialists, in particular, have been and will continue to be in high demand.

In 1999, the Legislature and Governor approved five new competitive grant programs, administered by the HECB, to foster innovation and to expand the instructional capacity of Washington’s higher education system in targeted fields. The Legislature provided funding to expand opportunities for students in information technology, teacher training, and child care, and to fund a wide range of creative new student-focused projects through the Fund for Innovation. In 2001, the Legislature will review the success of these ventures, based on information that becomes available in fall 2000, to determine whether they should be eliminated, revised, expanded or eliminated.

**HECB Request.**

- **High-demand Enrollment Pool - \$4.7 million in 2001-03** to fund 550 student FTE, system-wide. The program should remain a competitive venture administered by the HECB, and only a limited portion of the state's new higher education enrollments should be allocated in this manner. It is unreasonable to require higher education institutions to compete for more than a small portion of the new enrollments they need to expand students' education opportunities. However, the independent scrutiny afforded by the competitive review process significantly improved the quality of several of the 1999 proposals. (\$4.7 million in 1999-01)
- **Information Technology Matching Grants - \$2 million in 2001-03** to enhance student access to high-tech programs, and train more people to work in the under-employed high tech sector of Washington's economy.

Virtually all of the projects proposed by the baccalaureate institutions were funded, although the regional universities experienced some difficulty in attracting the required dollar-for-dollar private sector match. The HECB should consider rewarding the research institutions for their private fund-raising capabilities without reducing the funds available for the smaller regional institutions, perhaps by designating separate pools of funds for each group. (\$2 million in 1999-2001)

- **Teacher Training Pilot Projects - \$600,000 in 2001-03** to continue initial grants to Western Washington University and the Bothell branch of the University of Washington, and for commencement of up to two new projects during the biennium. Several grant proposals received strong support from the HECB's review committee, but could not be funded within the 1999-01 appropriation. (\$300,000 in 1999-01)
- **Fund for Innovation - \$600,000 in 2001-03** to encourage innovation in higher education. The HECB should develop possible funding priorities for the fund 2001-03. The Legislature is required to establish biennial priorities according to the terms of the governing statute for the Fund for Innovation. (\$600,000 in 1999-01)

**4. Implement Competency-based Higher Education --\$660,000 total request (1 FTE)**

Washington State has made student learning the highest priority in K-12 education; we must do the same in postsecondary education. Students, families, faculty, policymakers, and employers will benefit by knowing that a degree represents proficiency in identified knowledge and skill areas.

**A. Competency-based Admissions Standards Pilot Project - \$460,000 enhancement for 2001-2003** to 1.) expand the competency-based admissions standards pilot project from four pilot high schools to 12 high schools (\$250,000); and 2.) to expand monitoring of student success at the postsecondary level (\$210,000). (1 FTE)

**The Challenge.** The HECB is currently implementing a competency-based admissions standards system in response to K-12 education reform legislation. That legislation directed the HECB to design a system to replace the current college admissions standards. A critical component of this project involves teachers at four high schools (Selah, Mountlake Terrace, Kamiakin, and Lake Washington) in defining the minimum competency-based admissions requirements and measurements for them. The pilot project has provided a forum for high school and college faculty to work together to determine when and at what levels students meet post-Certificate of Mastery competencies.

This statutorily-directed project has been funded to date by state support for one HECB FTE, and two grants from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE). The FIPSE grants have funded the cost of per diem, travel, and substitute teachers, so that high school and college faculty can meet to set the proficiency standards. The grants expired in June 2000.

**HECB Request.** State funding would permit the project to continue its coordination with K-12 efforts. This proposal also would allow the HECB to expand the pilot project from four to 12 high schools and study the feasibility of expanding this model statewide. In addition, the proposal incorporates the expansion of a student follow-up system to monitor student success at the postsecondary level and the relationship of student success to high school preparation.

**B. Competency-based Degrees - \$200,000 in 2001-03** to support the development of three pilot competency-based baccalaureate degree programs.

**The Challenge.** Degrees are generally conferred on the basis of the accumulation of credits in fields of study. Although this system works well in many instances, it does not recognize the needs of some learners, including non-traditional learners.

**HECB Request.** The 2000 Master Plan introduced an initiative to identify the competencies associated with statewide associate transfer degrees and with baccalaureate degrees. To accomplish these tasks, a pilot will be implemented for establishing and assessing fundamental student learning outcomes in general education and three majors/degree programs that are competency-based. The pilot would engage three campuses where a partnership exists between a two- and-four-year public institution.

Funding would be used to (1) develop structures and competencies for three degrees; (2) develop an initial investigation of available assessments and designs; and (3) test and evaluate the assessments.

## **5. Washington State Displaced Homemaker Program -- \$400,000 total request**

**The Challenge.** The Displaced Homemaker Program has not received a significant funding increase since 1985. Although state law requires that program services be available statewide, current funding levels can support services in only 25 of 39 state counties. As a result, displaced homemakers in 14 counties have no resources or support to meet their unique needs, and because of their unique circumstances, are generally not eligible for any government financial support.

In addition, a growing number of people who don't speak English or come from diverse cultures are turning to the program for help. In most cases, contractors have neither the resources nor the training to serve these diverse populations. Finally, outdated forms, systems and methodologies make it difficult to track client outcomes and identify the number of displaced homemakers in the state.

**HECB Request.** The HECB, in cooperation with the Displaced Homemaker Program Statewide Advisory Committee, recommend a funding increase of approximately \$400,000 to achieve the following goals.

- 1. Expand services** and fully fund grants, increase rural outreach, fund new local programs and one regional pilot program, and reach diverse cultures and unserved populations.
- 2. Expand data collection and follow-up.** Design client forms, develop a follow-up instrument to track outcomes, and develop a methodology to estimate the number of displaced homemakers in Washington State.
- 3. Expand training opportunities for providers.** Add in-service training and increasing opportunities for specialized and topical training.
- 4. Develop informational materials.** Provide citizens information about the program.

**Results.** *The funding increase will allow the program to serve men and women in nine of the 14 currently unserved counties and reach out to more diverse audiences. In addition, it will allow the program to better track clients' success and improve evaluation and effectiveness.*

## **6. Higher Education Facility Condition Assessment -- \$1.4 million total request**

**The Challenge.** The chairwoman of the Senate Ways and Means Committee and the co-chairs of the House Capital Budget Committee have asked the HECB to submit a single prioritized list of proposed capital projects, including those both within and across sectors and institutions. A key focus was prioritizing "preservation" projects that reflected a "normalized" basis for establishing relative project priorities. However, to do this effectively requires a standardized method of evaluating facility condition.

For many years, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) has conducted a periodic assessment of the condition of system capital facilities in order to rank preservation

projects based on relative need. No similar, standardized condition assessment exists for the public baccalaureate institutions.

**HECB Request.** A standardized condition assessment of academic and support facilities at the public four-year institutions of higher education would allow the HECB to provide the Legislature with better data to evaluate preservation projects at the four-year schools.

***Architectural & Engineering Services***

Basic Services fee (condition assessment)	\$825,000
Ten percent contingency for Extra Services	\$82,500
CTC Standardization	\$50,000
Room Suitability Assessment	\$202,500
Technology Connectivity Assessment	\$202,500

***HECB Costs***

.33 FTE	\$40,000
Agency Expenses (printing, travel, etc.)	\$10,000
<b><i>Total</i></b>	<b><i>\$1,412,500</i></b>

**RESOLUTION 00-23**

Whereas, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is a nine-member citizen board, directed in statute “...to represent the broad public interest above the individual interests of the institutions” [RCW 28B.80.320].

Whereas, The Higher Education Coordinating Board administers all state-funded financial aid so that loans, grants, and work — state and federal — may be coordinated to provide the best possible service to students and make best use of state resources;

Whereas, The Board also provides policy, regulatory, and fiscal recommendations at the request of the Legislature and governor; and

Whereas, The development the HECB agency budget request is founded on the goals of the Master Plan, specifically, those within the immediate jurisdiction of HECB operations: student financial aid, policy research, enrollment planning, development of competency-based admissions and degree programs, capital planning, and other direct student services; and

Whereas, The budget request reflects the comments and decisions of the Board’s Fiscal Subcommittee; and

Whereas, The Office of Financial Management has directed public agencies to submit budget requests for the 2001-03 biennium by September 5, 2000;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approved the biennial budget request presented to the Board on July 26, 2000, and directs staff to refine and redraft the request to accommodate OFM submittal requirements by September 5, 2000.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

**HECB 2001-2003 PROPOSED AGENCY BUDGET: Worksheet**  
**General Fund State Only**  
(Dollars in thousands)

<b>Carry Forward and Maintenance Level:</b>	<b>General Fund-State</b>
1999-2001 Expenditure Authority	<b>\$ 241,000</b>
Proposed Changes	5,900
Maintenance Level Adjustment	100
<b>Total Carry Forward and Maintenance Level for 2001-2003</b>	<b>\$ 247,000</b>
Percent Change	2.5%

**Proposed Enhancements:**

**1. Student Aid**

A. State Need Grant	167,900	39,800
B. State Work Study	30,700	7,500
C. Promise Scholarship	11,400	10,000
<b>Student Aid Total</b>	<b>210,000</b>	<b>57,300</b>

**2. Digital Government Initiative**

A. Higher Education Lifelong Learning Network	-	1,300
B. Reduce Barriers to Student Transfer and Articulation	-	300
C. Integrate & Update Public Higher Ed Data & Technology Systems	-	1,600
<b>Digital Government Initiative Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,200</b>

**3. Enhance Student Opportunity & Inst. Capacity**

A. Enrollment Accommodation Pool @ 500 FTE	-	4,300
B. High Demand Enrollments & Grant Programs	7,650	7,900
<b>Enhance Student Opportunity &amp; Inst. Capacity Total</b>	<b>7,650 **</b>	<b>12,200</b>

**4. Implement Competency-Based Higher Ed**

A. Competency-Based Admissions Standards	150	460
B. Competency-Based Degrees	-	200
<b>Implement Competency-Based Higher Ed Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>660</b>

**5. Displaced Homemaker Program**

1,060                      400

**6. Facility Condition Assessment**

-                                1,400

<b>Total Proposed Enhancements</b>	<b>\$ 75,160</b>
Student Aid Enhancement as Percentage of 1999-01 level	24%
Other Enhancements as Percentage of 1999-01 level	7%

<b>Grand Total for Proposed 2001-03 Budget</b>	<b>\$ 322,160</b>
Total Percent Change from 1999-01 level	33.5%

\* Proposed changes include a number of technical adjustments that include biennialization and pension allocations adjustments.

\*\* Requested funding for High Demand Enrollments and Grant Programs would renew those programs at the 1999-01 level.

## **HIGH-DEMAND ENROLLMENTS**

### **Final FTE Allocation**

*July 2000*

### **BACKGROUND**

The 1999-01 state operating budget included funds to support the development and expansion of “high-demand” programs at Washington’s public colleges and universities during the 2000-2001 academic year. The Legislature directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board to solicit competitive program proposals from the public two-year and four-year colleges and universities. And the budget called upon the HECB to allocate up to 500 full-time enrollments in programs that are in demand from both students and employers, such as information technology, health care, and teacher training.

To review and evaluate program proposals, the HECB established a committee composed of education, business, labor market and economic development specialists from inside and outside of Washington State. Members of the review committee are listed in Appendix 2.

Based on the recommendations of the review committee, the HECB allocated the 500 enrollments in December 1999. During the 2000 legislative session, lawmakers noted that the winning projects did not consume all the budgeted funds, so they directed the Board to allocate an additional 50 student FTEs to community and technical colleges on the basis of proposals submitted last fall.

In June 2000, the HECB review committee considered the highest-rated projects that were not funded in the initial allocation. The reviewers recommend that the Board fund two additional enrollment proposals: at Bates Technical College in Tacoma and at Pierce College at Puyallup.

### **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION SUMMARY**

▸ **May 1999:** \$4.75 million appropriated to the HECB to support up to 500 full-time student enrollments (FTEs) in high-demand fields and programs during 2000-2001.

▸ **August 1999:** The HECB issued a request for proposals to the public community and technical colleges and public baccalaureate college and universities.

▸ **October 1999:** The HECB received proposals for 41 specific high-demand projects. The institutions requested \$9.9 million to support a total of 1,461 new enrollments, nearly three times the enrollment level authorized by the Legislature. A committee composed of HECB staff and expert advisers from other public- and private-sector organizations was asked to review the proposals and recommend projects for funding.



- **November 1999:** The review committee recommended a total of 11 projects for funding.
- **December 1999:** The HECB received and approved the recommendations of the review committee, authorizing its staff to develop interagency agreements that would direct funds and the authority to increase enrollments to the successful institutions as soon as possible after July 1, 2000. A total of \$424,340 remained uncommitted following the first round of approvals.
- **April 2000:** The Legislature and Governor directed the HECB to allocate remaining funds to support 50 additional high-demand enrollments. In a footnote to the 2000 supplemental state budget, the Board is directed to fund “up to two more proposals it received from community colleges” in high-demand fields from the original appropriation.
- **June 2000:** The review committee recommends the HECB provide funding and enrollment authorization for 25 FTEs at Bates Technical College for the expansion of the computer systems/networking technician program; and 25 FTEs at Pierce College's campus in Puyallup to develop a computer network engineering program based on the college's existing program at Fort Lewis.

## SUMMARY OF REVIEW COMMITTEE PRIORITIES

The HECB has relied upon the recommendations of a 14-member review committee composed of specialists in education, business, economic development, and labor-market analysis. The review committee appreciated the willingness of the community and technical colleges and baccalaureate institutions to provide additional information to clarify their proposals, and to make adjustments in the scale and scope of the projects to enable the state's resources to be more precisely focused toward the objectives of the program. The committee believes in the value of a competitive process for high-demand programs, and the external reviewers have suggested several strategies for improving the process.

During their deliberations — particularly when they were challenged to choose between projects that received roughly equivalent initial rankings — the reviewers generally expressed the following policy priorities:

**Expansion of existing programs.** After it selected the “consensus” projects, the committee tended to favor the expansion of existing programs over the creation of new ones. The belief that the state would receive the greatest value by expanding programs that had a proven track record was especially important in the June 2000 recommendations, reflecting the short time available for institutions to begin to meet their enrollment targets.

**Long-term career value.** In the information technology field, the reviewers agreed that while current employment demand is very strong for graduates of web development programs, the instruction provided through computer network engineer/technician programs probably will provide a deeper foundation of knowledge and greater long-term career value to students.

**Mix of short- and long-term training.** In the final recommendations, the group expressed the usefulness to students of funding a mix of short- and longer-term training programs. The Bates program is for nine months of instruction, while Pierce's is a two-year offering.

**Competitive faculty salaries.** The reviewers are concerned that faculty salaries are too low in information technology programs to ensure the recruitment and retention of skilled faculty. This is a problem throughout higher education. For example, several of the proposals from community and technical colleges indicate that students who complete IT programs may earn significantly more than their instructors after just a year or two of training. Baccalaureate institutions also report significant challenges as they attempt to recruit and retain faculty in IT programs.

## **RECOMMENDED BOARD ACTION**

Following its review and evaluation of the proposals, the review committee recommends the Board approve the following actions:

- 1. Authorize the HECB staff to develop contracts** for the projects proposed by the successful institutions whose proposals are described below; and
- 2. Direct the HECB staff to work with the institutions to clarify** any unresolved issues, such as the specific elements and funding levels of the proposed programs, as it develops the contracts.

The projects recommended by the review committee are:

### **Bates Technical College: Computer Systems/Networking Technician – 25 FTE**

Bates proposes the expansion of its information technology programs through the addition of an intensive nine-month program to train network support technicians. The review committee noted the strong, ongoing employment demand for network technicians, and Bates's commitment to serve women and students of color. Students who complete this training will work as network technicians, local-area network (LAN) specialists, computer-repair specialists, and help-desk and management information-systems specialists.

**Pierce College at Puyallup: Computer Network Engineering (CNE) – 25 FTE**

Pierce proposes to develop a two-year program to prepare students to install and support computers and networks by revising the CNE program it currently offers at Fort Lewis. The Puyallup program will provide a learning pathway for students in several area high schools, and will build upon existing Pierce-Puyallup programs in hardware systems and micro-processors. The review committee was pleased to note that the curricula for the new program — and for all of Pierce's computer information systems programs — are being rewritten to employ the industry skill standards developed by the Northwest Center for Emerging Technology.

**NEXT STEPS**

Following the Board's action, interagency agreements will be developed between the HECB and the institutions, spelling out the terms under which the new enrollments and funding are being provided, including such details as program assessment and reporting requirements. The HECB executive director and a designated representative of each institution will sign the agreements.

Funds will be distributed to the institutions as soon as the agreements are signed. Recipients of the funding will contribute information to the HECB by December 2000 for a preliminary report to the Governor and the Legislature in 2001. Subsequent institutional reports will be due to the HECB by August 1, 2001.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-24**

WHEREAS, the Higher Education Coordinating Board has been directed by the Legislature and Governor, under the terms of the state's 2001-03 operating budget, to allocate funds to support 550 new full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollments to high-demand fields and programs in the public baccalaureate and public community and technical colleges during the 2000-2001 academic year; and

WHEREAS, the Board implemented a competitive bidding process for those new enrollments in consultation with the Office of Financial Management and the legislative budget committees, as called for in Section 610(3) of Senate Bill 5180, the state's 1999-2001 operating budget; and

WHEREAS, the Board allocated the first 500 of the authorized enrollments in December 1999, based on the recommendations of a review committee composed of educators, labor market and economic development specialists from Washington and other states; and

WHEREAS, following the completion of the initial process, the 2000 Legislature authorized the Board to allocate an additional 50 FTE to up to two additional projects proposed by the community and technical colleges, thus bringing the total biennial high-demand enrollment pool to 550 FTE; and

WHEREAS, the Board's review committee has recommended that two additional community and technical college projects – at Bates Technical College and Pierce College – receive the funding necessary to support the remaining 50 enrollment slots authorized in the high-demand enrollment process;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the HECB approves the recommendations of its high-demand enrollment review committee and directs the staff to execute interagency agreements for the allocation of the new enrollments and the release of related funding;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the HECB staff is directed to work with the institutions to address any remaining unresolved issues related to the interagency agreements, including consistent methods for tracking and reporting the expanded enrollments to the Legislature and Governor.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

# **MASTER PLAN ENROLLMENT AND CAPITAL ASSUMPTIONS ASSESSMENT Preliminary Findings**

*July 2000*

## **BACKGROUND**

In its approval of joint resolution SCR 8425, accepting the HECB Master Plan as state higher education policy, the Legislature instructed the HECB to reassess its enrollment and capital assumptions, including a re-examination of the following:

- Projected upper-division and graduate enrollments;
- The role of the community and technical colleges; and
- Assumptions in regard to meeting capital needs.

In addition, the resolution directed the Board to “prepare an enrollment accommodation plan....contemplate various growth scenarios....(and) examine alternatives to address the identified budget needs.” HECB staff have been actively working with the higher education institutions and all interested and involved organizations to implement these instructions.

## **PART I: MASTER PLAN ENROLLMENT GOALS**

The 2000 HECB Master Plan set out enrollment goals for the state for the year 2010. From a state policy perspective, these goals for state-funded students at public institutions consist of two elements:

1. An increase of 36,300 average annual full-time enrollments (FTEs) at all levels by 2010 to maintain the current rate of participation, and
2. An increase of 16,200 upper-division/graduate/professional FTEs to provide opportunity for a greater proportion of students to continue their education and develop the skills they need to participate at the highest levels of the state’s economy.

Together, this increase of 52,500 public-supported FTEs presents a serious financial challenge to the state and its institutions — to fund both the enrollments themselves and the capital facilities needed to accommodate them.

Understandably, the Legislature is interested in receiving more information about these goals and about the policy options and variables that will affect enrollment demand over the next 10 years. Hence, the HECB was instructed to work with all the institutions and appropriate organizations to complete this re-examination, identify options and choices, review assumptions, and discuss alternative growth scenarios.

**The Enrollment Assessment Study Team.** To complete this re-examination, a total of 11 large meetings and numerous smaller gatherings and conversations have occurred since the end of the legislative session. The following people attended various meetings and discussions:

<b>SBCTC:</b>	Scott Morgan, Loretta Seppanen, Sandy Wall, Jan Yoshiwara		Jean Six/Senate Higher Ed.
<b>UW:</b>	Fred Campbell, Debra Friedman, Harlan Patterson, Tim Washburn, John Swiney	<b>OFM:</b>	Irv Lefberg, Wolfgang Opitz, Pat Tasanasanta, Theo Yu, Sarah Corrie, Ta-Win Lin, Theresa Lowe
<b>WSU:</b>	Larry Ganders, Rom Markin, Jim Rimpau, Karl Boehmke	<b>COP:</b>	Terry Teale, Carolyn Sundby, Cindy Flynn
<b>CWU:</b>	Greg Chan, David Dauwalder, Martha Lindley, Mark Lundgren, Mike Reilly	<b>WTECB:</b>	John Bauer, Bryan Wilson
<b>EWU:</b>	Peter Dual, Mary Voves, George Durrie, Carol Terry	<b>WAICU:</b>	Violet Boyer, Tom Parker, Ron Urban (Whitman College)
<b>WWU:</b>	George Pierce, Judy McNickle, Andrew Bodman, Jack Cooley	<b>CASELOAD FORECASTING COUNCIL:</b>	John Steiger
<b>TESC:</b>	Ruta Fanning, Steve Hunter, Barbara Smith, Steve Trotter, Kim Merriman	<b>EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DEPT:</b>	Gary Kamimura
<b>LEG:</b>	Karen Barrett/Senate Ways & Means Jack Daray/House Appropriations Mike Groesch/Senate Ways & Means Erika Prager/House Higher Ed. Bill Robinson/House Capital	<b>HECB:</b>	Evelyn Hawkins, Jim Reed, John Fricke, Dan Keller, Kathy Raudenbush, Linda Lamar, Marty Harding, Parker Lindner, Patty Mosqueda, Tom Weko, Whitney DalBalcon, Bruce Botka, Linda Schactler

This study team will continue to meet and discuss findings and new information until a final report is presented to the HECB for approval in the fall. After that, conversations and information-sharing will continue as enrollment experience unfolds and more is learned about these issues.

### The HECB 2000 Master Plan Enrollment Goals

Building a bridge of understanding between the enrollment goals laid out in the HECB 2000 Master Plan and this report will be aided by a discussion of some concepts and assumptions that underlie the goals. Traditionally, enrollment levels have been viewed in terms of “participation rate”: simply the percentage of the population that is involved in either lower-division or upper-division/graduate/professional education. This approach is practical, because data exists that allow us to readily compare Washington State with all the other states. Data from 1997 reveals the following findings:

1. Overall, state residents participate in public post-secondary education at a rate that places Washington **10<sup>th</sup>** among the 50 states.
2. A particularly strong community and technical college system with a wide-ranging mission and an open-door enrollment policy places Washington **7<sup>th</sup>** among states in public lower-division participation.
3. But, Washington ranks **41<sup>st</sup>** among states in participation at the public upper-division/graduate/professional level.

In short, all the institutions (and particularly the community and technical colleges) are providing outstanding opportunity for state residents to achieve their educational goals through the lower division level. But the Master Plan expresses the goal that the state can

and should do more to expand enrollment opportunities for students who want to pursue education goals at the upper-division level and beyond. The HECB members feel this is particularly important in a state that has a significant job vacancy rate in information technology jobs in all sectors of the economy.

This state has a history of importing highly skilled (and highly paid) workers to fill the fast growing hiring needs of employers. The HECB has proposed that more opportunity be provided to state residents to obtain the education and skills necessary for these jobs. Washington business strongly supports the expansion of education opportunity at all levels to provide the trained workforce that is required for continued growth and prosperity.

**Master Plan Upper-division Goals.** Some questions have been raised about the focus of the Master Plan on increasing upper-division/graduate/professional participation. At the same time, the Master Plan proposes significant lower-division enrollment increases, although *participation rates* would remain constant. This focus is simply a matter of directing the policy discussion to the area where the state can and should do more. It is not intended to re-direct support or commitment from the community and technical colleges. Rather it is to complement and build on the success the two-year colleges have achieved.

The community and technical colleges currently enroll about a quarter of a million people every quarter, and the HECB 2000 Master Plan calls for that number to increase at the same rate as population. The level of opportunity (or rate of participation) in community and technical college programs is proposed to remain at the current high level.

Still, maintaining a strong and growing two-year college system is not enough. The state needs teachers in our schools, and technology, construction and health care professionals with baccalaureate and graduate training. The community colleges can help prepare residents for these programs, but the capacity to award baccalaureate and advanced degrees in these fields must come from the four-year institutions in the state's higher education system. The Office of Financial Management (OFM) projects community and technical college enrollment by type of student. OFM projections indicate the greatest growth in the number of two-year college students is likely to be in the academic area. Many of these students can be expected to continue their education in baccalaureate institutions.

The operative word in this discussion of growing enrollments in the higher education system is the word "system." Education opportunities at *all* levels must be available for the system to work for the benefit of students and the state. *All* the parts of the system must be strong and healthy for the students to be served, and this is a key message of the HECB 2000 Master Plan. Currently a portion of the state's public higher education system needs attention: The capacity of the baccalaureate institutions to educate upper-division/graduate/professional residents is *significantly less than average among the states*. Many would argue that only being average is not sufficient, but progress to that

goal over the next 10 years is the recommendation of the HECB. More discussion of education opportunity beyond 2010 will be the subject of future Master Plans.

**Analysis of the 1999-2000 Enrollment Situation.** One factor that prompted the Legislature to direct the HECB to reassess enrollment assumptions was slower growth in enrollment in fall 1999 than what the Legislature had budgeted. The 2000 Master Plan was delivered to the Legislature at the same time as baccalaureate “under-enrollment” reports. Therefore, although not stipulated in the legislative resolution adopting the Master Plan, a first logical step in the enrollment analysis process seemed to be to attempt to determine the causes of this slower-than-anticipated increase in enrollments.

**Current baccalaureate enrollment numbers.** The Office of Financial Management (OFM) reports that enrollment in public four-year institutions fell short of budgeted levels by 549 annual average full-time equivalents for the 1999-2000 academic year. This enrollment shortfall seems inconsistent with the HECB 2000 Master Plan goal that upper-division enrollment should be higher now and in the future, calling into question the amount of demand among students to enroll in upper-division programs.

**Factors that Reduced 1999 Fall Baccalaureate Enrollment Increases.** A discussion document (the complete document is included as Attachment A) has been prepared in cooperation with the Study Team that analyzes three factors affecting the 1999-2000 enrollment situation in the baccalaureate institutions and discusses the potential implications of these factors on enrollment planning in the future:

1. **An unanticipated change in student behavior.** In fall 1998, the average on-campus student at two baccalaureate institutions enrolled in slightly fewer credit hours, resulting in an unanticipated change in the conversion of student headcount into FTEs.<sup>1</sup> Reasons for this reduction seem to be: (1) more strict monitoring by the registrar of course pre-requisites, resulting in enrollment cancellations, (2) introduction of freshman courses that carried fewer credits than the courses they replaced, and (3) more students entering as freshmen with previously earned college credit, and taking fewer classes as a result.

Institutions are working to address the first two of these factors, and will monitor the third. Where appropriate, institutions will work with students to promote efficient progress toward their education goals.

2. **Fewer high school graduates entering baccalaureate institutions.** Fewer Washington high school graduates enrolled in baccalaureate institutions in fall 1999 than in fall 1998, even though the number of high school graduates increased by more than 2,000. Typically, baccalaureate institutions enroll about one of every six new high school graduates. Thus, an increase of 2,000 graduates would be expected to

---

<sup>1</sup> At WSU, the fall 1998 average on-campus Pullman student enrolled in 15.00 credit hours. In fall 1999, the average on-campus student enrolled in 14.83 credit hours, resulting in a campus-wide reduction of 150 FTEs given the same number of students.



increase baccalaureate entrance by over 300, rather than to decline by 97, as occurred in fall 1999. This situation was not anticipated.

Although data are limited and not always current, it does not appear that these students entered the workforce, attended a community college, or attended an independent, in-state college. The best test of whether this experience will recur is to examine fall 2000 freshmen acceptances and deposits. Freshmen enrollments are expected to be higher at both the University of Washington and Western Washington University, and most of the other institutions appear to have an adequate level of enrollments for fall 2000. Final numbers will be available when the term starts in September.

3. **Fewer transfer students entering baccalaureate institutions.** The third major factor behind lower-than-budgeted baccalaureate enrollment was a reduction in the number of transfer students. In fall 1999, fewer students transferred to baccalaureate institutions than in fall 1998. The flow of these transfers did improve in the remainder of the 1999-2000 academic year; the increase for the entire year was only 1.5 percent less than expected.

The community and technical colleges and baccalaureate institutions are examining how transfer students make their choices, and what can be done to assist these students make efficient progress toward their goals. Analyzing the reduction in transfers *among* the baccalaureate institutions is a more complicated matter. It involves choices among work, relocating to a distant campus, increasing opportunities to enter a chosen field of study in a growing number of campuses and centers, and the opportunity to engage in distance education. The baccalaureate institutions will be able to report transfer entrance data for fall 2000 later this year.

To summarize, it appears the reduction in average course loads and the lower numbers of freshmen enrolling directly in baccalaureate institutions are new and unexpected circumstances, but can be readily measured. The institutions have taken actions to address these two factors, and will monitor and report the results. The third factor, fewer transfer students, requires more study. Transfer behavior is more difficult to measure and understand. Again, institutions are aware of the change in transfer behavior and will be monitoring and reporting future experience.<sup>2</sup>

### **The Building Block Approach to Enrollment Analysis**

The HECB Master Plan goal is based on an approach that compares the relative level of opportunity for Washington residents to enjoy the benefits of higher education, versus the opportunity afforded in other states. Re-examining this approach is done by setting aside all the assumptions and state-to-state comparisons, and developing a totally different approach to defining a range of possible future enrollment levels. This alternative

---

<sup>2</sup> A more detailed examination of these factors and future implications is provided in the Attachment A of this report.

approach is designed to directly address some of the questions raised during the legislative discussion of the Master Plan. Then, the Master Plan goal can be compared to the range of enrollment levels that are identified to measure its reasonableness.

The analytical approach adopted by the HECB in May was developed to undertake this re-examination using building blocks to explain various components of the enrollment estimate. The purpose of the building-block approach is clarity; it allows the effect of each of several separate factors to be identified and discussed separately. This approach allows the presentation of variables/policy options to cover a broad range of alternative scenarios while still being understandable. It allows decision-makers to consider a variety of mixes of conditions and policy choices, and to see the combined effect on enrollments. It is a commonly used analytical tool to separately identify the individual effects on a calculation of a number of factors acting all at one time.

**First Building Block: Current Rate of Opportunity.** The baseline or first element of the building blocks is OFM's projection of the average annual FTE level required to maintain the current *rate* of opportunity (current service level) for a growing population. This is measured by holding constant the proportion of the state population receiving instruction at in-state public institutions, and calculating the increases in enrollment to educate that same proportion of a growing population. This baseline is adopted because maintaining the current level of opportunity is a value that is held as a top priority among the public, students, business, and decision-makers. *No participant in Master Plan enrollment assumptions reassessment has recommended reducing the opportunity for students to receive post-secondary education below current levels as an option to be considered.*

To calculate this baseline, OFM looks at the changing age and gender distribution of the state population over the next ten years, assumes that college-going behavior and all other policies and variables are held constant, and calculates what average annual enrollments might be in 2010. This exclusively population-based enrollment projection explicitly assumes that the future will look just like the present—except for the size, gender, and age distribution of the state's population. Similarly, it assumes all other factors such as the aspirations of the state's population, demands of the economy, state policies, etc. will look the same in 2010 as they do today. Since this is not the case, other major factors that will shape enrollment demand must also be considered. However, creating this baseline is helpful since it shows how enrollments might increase in order to serve a growing population — if no other factors are considered and no other policy choices are made.

It is important to clarify the utility of the participation rate calculation provided by OFM. Such a calculation takes into account the state's entire current student body and the entire potentially eligible population that could be enrolled. It encompasses many variables that have manifested themselves in current enrollment practices, and projects them into the future. Therefore, it does take into account variables, behaviors, and policies that have developed over time and are embedded in current experience. For example, recent

economic conditions, student demographics, tuition and financial aid policies, and outreach and retention efforts are all included in current enrollment measurements. Therefore, the participation rate approach does provide a solid basis for examining the potential effects of new or different variables and policy choices as an increment above or below the continuation of current experience.

In the year since this participation-rate calculation was made for the HECB 2000 Master Plan, OFM has new data and population projections upon which to base a revised calculation. This re-calculation provides the re-examination instructed by the Legislature. **OFM's recalculated estimate for 2010 average annual FTE enrollment to maintaining the current rate of service is 35,200, compared to 36,300 estimated for the HECB Master Plan — a reduction of about 3 percent.** All of this difference is in the estimated enrollment in baccalaureate institutions at all levels; the estimate for community and technical college enrollment is virtually unchanged.

**Additional Building Blocks: Consider Variables and Policy Choices.** Separate from the baseline projection is a discussion of other variables and policy choices than might affect these enrollment levels over time. Last spring, the HECB, colleges and universities, and other organizations worked together to identify, define, and quantify (where possible) the most significant variables and policy choices expected to affect enrollments. These factors cover the areas that were discussed in the legislative consideration of the Master Plan goals. The variables and policy choices were separated into three general policy areas: economic, education, and demographic/behavioral.

**HECB adoption of Enrollment Analysis Framework.** In May, the HECB adopted this approach to examining alternatives regarding the enrollment issues, through Resolution 00-16. The resolution directed staff to communicate the resolution and related information to the appropriate members and committees of the Washington Legislature and the Office of the Governor and to the institutions and organizations involved in the development process. And the Board directed staff to continue to go forward with the development of the framework.

**Development of the Enrollment Analysis Framework.** The Study Team participants divided into three groups to look at the variables and policy choices articulated in the framework. Included in this document is a brief discussion of each issue area. These issue briefs describe the variable or policy choice, identify its parameters and some options, and quantify (where possible) the enrollment effects of each of the identified options.

Each of the variables or policy choices identified is discussed separately. Clearly, many of these variables and policy choices are inter-connected and related in many ways. However, for the purpose of clarity it is necessary to separate them and discuss each one individually. In this way, decision-makers can gain a better understanding of how each separate decision or variable might have an impact, and how the accumulation of these factors might affect the total. The quantification effort is undertaken with the best

information available, and presents either numbers or ranges whenever appropriate. This presentation is intended to be a first step aimed at identifying the order of magnitude related to each factor, with more precision coming in future years as these factors are continually discussed and reviewed.

The study team selected variables and policy choices for analysis that represent the most significant factors that may affect publicly funded enrollments. In some cases, little is known about what the future holds; quantifying the enrollment impact of various alternatives cannot be done with precision. Still, it is important to recognize the variables and policy choices that are discussed, and monitor them over time so that we can learn more about their effects.

## ECONOMIC EFFECTS

The question that guides the work on this issue is this: What sort of enrollments will our system of postsecondary education need in the decade ahead to respond appropriately to the needs of Washington's economy? To proceed more expeditiously with its work, the Work Group on Economy and Enrollments has disaggregated this question into four parts.

1. What **fluctuations in the business cycle** (e.g. in employment and earnings) are likely to occur, and how do these influence enrollments in postsecondary education?
2. What sorts of **long-run, structural changes** are at work in our state's economy, and how do these shape the need for postsecondary enrollments in Washington?
3. In response to the **demands and opportunities of an information economy**, new providers of postsecondary education and training are flourishing. Traditional institutions of postsecondary education are responding to these new opportunities and competitors in creative ways. How will these developments shape the need for publicly funded postsecondary enrollments?
4. Given these developments, **what is an appropriate response** to the needs of Washington's economy?

Although the analysis on these questions is not complete, the work group has reached preliminary answers to the first three questions:

**The business cycle does shape enrollments.** All other factors held constant, each 1 percent increase in the average wage of high school graduates ages 18-24 results in a decline of 226 headcount in 4-year public institutions; each 1 percent increase in unemployment yields an increase of 888 enrollments (headcount) in these institutions. Students are sensitive to the opportunity cost of attending public baccalaureate institutions. Enrolling in a four-year institution becomes more attractive than participating in a job market when wages fall and employment is uncertain. Enrolling in a four-year institution is somewhat less attractive when a robust job market beckons.

Two-year enrollments are *positively* linked to the business cycle, rather than substantially counter-cyclical, as is the case for public four-year enrollments.

That said, we do not know with great precision how the state's economy will be performing ten years from now. Thus, it is difficult to assess the impact of the business cycle on enrollments in the later years of our forecast. Moreover, the business cycle is, by definition, cyclical: in the long run its fluctuations tend to cancel one another out. Seen from the perspective of long-term planning, business cycles are short-term and random fluctuations around underlying long-term forces, both demographic and economic. The focus should properly be on these, rather than the short-term forces at work in our state's economy.

**The primary long-term force at work in our state's economy is the increasing demand for highly skilled workers.** New technologies and new business practices have led employers increasingly to seek out highly skilled workers, and these forces will continue to shape our economy. The state's Employment Security Department forecasts that about one in three jobs created between 1998 and 2008 will require a baccalaureate or advanced degree education, and that six in ten of the jobs in Washington will require more than one year of postsecondary training or education.

Although it is clear that an increasing share of Washington's workforce will need to be increasingly skilled, it is not entirely clear **who** will provide this training and education, or **how** it will be provided. This is a time of enormous change in postsecondary education. The work group is examining the growth of new education and training alternatives, such as the burgeoning information technology certification industry, and assessing its impact on publicly funded postsecondary enrollments.

Given these developments, is the maintenance of current levels of service (current participation rates) an appropriate response to the needs of Washington's economy? With work still in progress, we have not yet arrived at an answer to this question. In light of the work completed thus far, we anticipate that *public postsecondary enrollments will need to grow at a faster rate than our population* to keep pace with the changing demands of our economy.

## EDUCATION POLICIES

The Education Policies work group is investigating the possible effects of education policy decisions on future higher education enrollment. Issues under consideration and analysis include the following:

► **Cost of attendance:** The group will describe the tuition and financial aid issues that could affect enrollment by 2010. They also will investigate research that might have tracked the enrollment impacts of tuition changes, and will describe the implications of

financial aid policies and funding levels on student participation and the mix of students served.

‣ **K-12 reform and dual credit programs:** The group will attempt project future participation in dual enrollment programs such as Running Start, College in the High School and Advanced Placement. The work group is hopeful that other states, such as Oregon and Wisconsin, will have useful information about the effect on college enrollment of their K-12 reform efforts, however it may be difficult to quantify future affects on enrollment.

‣ **Outreach activities:** The work group is reviewing the possible affect of current outreach efforts (and its predecessor, NEISP) on college enrollment of students from under-represented groups. The Washington Association of Independent Colleges and Universities will attempt to develop information about the experience of TRIO programs in Washington State.

‣ **Transfer issues:** Two kinds of transfers appear to have the most significant potential impact on future enrollment: transfers out of the two-year colleges into the baccalaureates, and transfers among the baccalaureate institutions. Information has been provided that indicate the number of transfers from community and technical colleges to public baccalaureate institutions actually declined by 2 percent in 1999-2000. While the increasing **number** of transfer students from community and technical colleges who are expected move to baccalaureate institutions appears to be built into OFM's long-term enrollment forecast, it is possible that the existing **rate** of transfer could change, which would affect the steady-state numbers. The group intends to analyze information related to the admittance of transfer students into the baccalaureate institutions, as well as analyzing patterns in the transfer of students among the baccalaureates.

‣ **Student retention efforts:** Since the baccalaureate institutions have all designated retention strategies in the performance accountability process, the HECB and COP staff will analyze current institutional performance and state goals for retention and determine whether it's possible to predict an impact on 2010 enrollment.

‣ **Program-based policy decisions:** Three areas of enrollment policy that appear likely for legislative intervention — beyond the OFM carry-forward enrollment increases — are high-demand enrollment, information technology instruction, and teacher training.

There are examples of legislative, gubernatorial, institutional and HECB interest in all three areas, including this biennium's high-demand enrollments and information technology matching grants, and the creation of the master's in teaching reimbursement, teacher training pilot projects, and future teachers conditional scholarship demonstration project. This discussion will be coordinated with the economic impact work group's effort to elaborate on the implications of possible decisions to address the "skills gap" by expanding programs at the two- and four-year institutions.

## DEMOGRAPHIC/BEHAVIORAL VARIABLES

The baseline projection of enrollment in 2010, as calculated by OFM, is entirely based on demographic variables of age and gender. Other demographic variables might adjust the projection if appropriate data can be found. Examples of other variables include race/ethnicity of the population in 2010, or the variation in expected income levels of the population by 2010. If the population in 2010 is significantly different for these variables compared to the current situation, baseline enrollment projections based only on age and gender may need to change. The following discusses briefly how these variables could be analyzed; to date, no specific adjustments have been made to the baseline.

► **Race/ethnicity:** The population of the state is growing, and the population of various race/ethnic groups is growing at a greater rate than in the past. Will a larger proportion of some race/ethnic groups have an impact on future higher education enrollments? It would be useful to be able to estimate the impact of changing race/ethnic demographics, but data are limited. Ideally, a current participation rate would be calculated based on enrollment by age/race/ethnicity for each single year of age. This participation rate would be applied to projections of the population in 2010 – again disaggregated by single year of age for each race/ethnic group. As an example, the percentage of 18 year-old Asian students in 1999 (compared to the total state population of Asians who are 18) would be calculated. This percentage would be applied to the projected population of Asians who will be 18 in 2010. The result would be the expected enrollment in 2010 of Asian students.

Unfortunately, the detailed data to make these calculations may not be available. The work group is continuing to explore the possibility of estimating, in some manner, projected changes in the race/ethnic population of the state, and the consequent effect on enrollments.

► **Regional population variations:** State population is concentrated more heavily in some regions of the state than in others; the geographic location of higher education institutions leaves some parts of the state less accessible to learners. The disparity in availability of education resources may affect current enrollments, and might also alter projected 2010 enrollments. One avenue for examining regional variations is through county-level data. The Office of Financial Management provides data on participation rates in higher education by county. It may be possible to apply current county participation rates to future projections of county populations, which would provide an estimate of future enrollments by county. Whether this would alter statewide higher education enrollment projections needs to be explored.

► **Changes in immigration patterns:** Population projections into the future take into account expected levels of immigration. However, it has been noted that there are increasing numbers of immigrants, from Eastern Europe and elsewhere, who are requesting training in English as a Second Language (ESL), particularly at community colleges. Demand for this service appears to be growing faster than what is included in

baseline calculations. Therefore, projections of enrollment may need to increase by several thousand FTE to accommodate a greater need for ESL services.

► **Income levels of the population:** Data indicate that state average income levels are consistently rising. However, data also indicate that some segments of the population may see very little or no increase, other segments may have incomes growing substantially. Disparities in income across the population appear to be increasing, and this will affect the ability of a potentially larger segment of the population to enroll in higher education. Availability of data to estimate the impact of income variables will be explored. However, it is also expected that the state's provision of financial aid will continue to meet future students' needs.

## PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN ENROLLMENT STUDY TEAM FINDINGS

Analysis is continuing by the work groups to develop estimates for the policy choices and variables that are being examined. For some of the policy choices or variables it will not be possible to create an estimate with currently available data. It will also be important to separate (where possible) the impact of the different variables on either lower division or upper division/graduate/professional enrollments. The choices and variables will be monitored over time and, where possible, estimates will be developed and presented in future discussions of enrollment planning. The discussions and analysis for the Study team from spring through July have yielded two preliminary findings:

1. The range of enrollment outcomes over the next ten years can vary widely depending on the choices of policy-makers, changes in the economy, and shifts in state demographics; and
2. Some of the variables and policy choices will affect enrollments, however their effect cannot be quantified at this time. These are important factors and should be carefully monitored in the future.

Further discussions and analysis among Study Team participants will continue through fall to continue to refine preliminary findings, including the following:

1. **Demographics appear to be the primary driver of overall enrollment levels**, but significant impact on upper-division/graduate/professional enrollment will result from the success of state policy initiatives. Examples include improving retention and transfer rates, expanding outreach, and targeting enrollments to high demand areas.
2. **Various factors and needs, such as rapidly increasing demand for English as a Second Language among immigrants to Washington, are likely to drive community and technical college enrollment increases *higher* than the 20,900 FTEs called for in the Master Plan.**



3. **The fundamental basis for the establishment of enrollment goals deserves more discussion.** The HECB approached the creation of the Master Plan enrollment goal primarily on the basis of providing a level of *opportunity* to residents that is commensurate with what residents of other states enjoy. Other approaches do exist. The Workforce Board attempts to measure a “skills gap” – the unfilled demand for educated workers – and the resulting lower-division goal is much higher than that cited in the Master Plan. The State Board for Community and Technical Colleges analyzes projected enrollment increases by balancing the capacity of the colleges and the level of resources expected to be available. All these approaches add insight to the discussion about enrollment goals.
4. **The role of financial aid in controlling the net cost of education to needy students is a major factor.** Financial aid is the tool we use today to ameliorate the effect of increasing college costs on the ability of low-income students to go to college. The state’s commitment to financial aid is essential to provide educational opportunity for all citizens, and will continue to be important in the future. While it is not clear whether financial aid alone will directly affect the number of students who enroll, it has a significant impact on the diversity of students who can afford to attend college.
5. **Student behavior is likely to continue to confound the best projections** — regardless of the level of effort directed at enrollment prediction and management — but only in the short term. While institutions may not be able to predict the precise level of enrollment in any one term or academic year, history shows that the longer-term plans are always achieved. As long as Washington has a growing population the enrollment assessment group believes that the challenge to public higher education will be to plan how to grow, not whether to grow.
6. **How to expand capacity to accommodate enrollment is a major policy and budgetary decision** emerging from this re-examination of enrollment goals. Two options include whether the state should:
  - a.) plan for expanding physical and program capacity to deal with growing enrollments, or
  - b) wait to see a demonstration of demand by students that exceeds the capacity of institutions.

The first approach, which the HECB recommended in the 2000 Master Plan, calls for the investment of public funds in time to prepare for and orderly growth in institutional capacity and programs. The second approach delays those costs into the future. This approach may place public higher education in a “catch-up mode” which is unlikely to benefit students.

## PART II: CAPACITY PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS REASSESSMENT

**Re-examining Capital Space and Budget Needs.** The work group established in April 2000 to re-examine the space planning assumptions and associated capital cost estimates included in the Master Plan completed its review in June. The group reviewed the following planning standards and factors used in the Master Plan:

- The physical inventory of “core” academic spaces (classrooms, class labs, and faculty offices)
- The method of estimating existing enrollment capacity
- Room and station utilization standards and goals
- Assumptions concerning the possible effect of E-learning on scheduled instructional space capacity
- The space type and allocation square footage standards used in estimating instructional and support space needs for projected enrollment growth
- The unit cost factor used in estimating capital expenditure needs

The capital work group generally agreed that those planning factors represented a reasonable basis for arriving at a *Master Plan level* estimate of space and capital needs associated with enrollment growth through 2010. The group recognized and agreed that the actual future costs of housing additional students can be precisely estimated only on a project-by-project basis, and that the Master Plan estimates provided an “order of magnitude” analysis of future higher education capital needs.

As they discussed these issues, some work group members felt the Board’s new, higher utilization goals for scheduled instructional space would be difficult to achieve, while others felt the same goals were too conservative. Similarly, some members felt the Board’s e-learning assumption was conservative and others expressed uncertainty over the future effect of e-learning on space needs.

Meanwhile, the work group continues to discuss and advise HECB staff on the development of a single, prioritized ranking method for HECB capital budget recommendations. This ranking method is being developed at the request of legislative capital budget leaders, to assist in the development of the 2001-03 state capital budget. At its July 10 meeting, the work group reviewed the preliminary scoring factors and preliminary score values. Participants agreed to provide suggested revisions to HECB staff by the end of July. Future meetings will be scheduled over the summer to finalize the scoring method and obtain institutional input on their respective capital budget proposals.

## **BOARD ACTION REQUESTED**

At the July 26 meeting, the Board is requested to approve a resolution that:

1. Recognizes the progress and preliminary findings of the Study Team on the enrollment analysis framework;
2. Recognizes that the study teams have reviewed and accepted the capital and space planning methodology used in the 2000 Master Plan; and
3. Directs staff to communicate these preliminary findings to the Legislature and Governor, and to continue to work collaboratively with the state's higher education institutions to develop conclusions for presentation to the HECB in fall 2000.

## ATTACHMENT A:

**EXAMINING BACCALAUREATE ENROLLMENT IN THE  
1999-2000 ACADEMIC YEAR****Background**

Average annual student FTE enrollment budgeted for the 1998-99 academic year was 200,528. The 1999-2001 budget called for an increase of 8,277 over two years, an increase of just over 4.1 percent. This aggressive rate of growth in students served was spread across almost all the institutions, with about 40 percent of the growth planned in the first year and 60 percent of the growth planned in the second year of the biennium.

Based on actual enrollments for the 1999-2000 academic year (AY 2000), OFM reports that the community and technical colleges exceeded their budgeted enrollment level by about 4,000 student FTEs and that the baccalaureate institutions fell short by about 549 student FTEs. In total, all public higher education institutions exceeded budgeted levels by about 3,500 annual average student FTEs.

This under-enrollment at the baccalaureate institutions has sparked substantial discussion, even though it amounts to only two-thirds of one percent. Budget and policy decision-makers are asking why under-enrollment occurred, and what it might mean for future estimates of enrollment demand. Complicating this discussion is that virtually all the enrollment shortfall occurred in two institutions on three campuses in eastern Washington: WSU Pullman, WSU Tri-Cities, and (CWU) Ellensburg. The other four baccalaureate institutions nearly reached or exceeded their budgeted enrollment levels.

In the 2000 session of the Legislature responded by reducing overall state-funded baccalaureate enrollments for AY 2001 by 188, and making adjustments among institutions. These adjustments and reductions were made in cooperation with the institutions, and were intended to better align budgeted enrollments for next year with expected levels of attendance.

The following discussion will examine possible explanations for the current enrollment situation in the baccalaureate institutions, and discuss implications for estimates of future enrollment demand for those institutions.

**Perspective**

Before examining some possible explanations of the enrollment situation in AY 2000, it is important to consider the following:

- Public higher education institutions (two-year and four-year) **exceeded their budgeted enrollment levels** by about 3,500 FTEs in AY 2000..
- Public higher education institutions (two-year and four-year) **increased enrollment by almost 3,900** in AY 2000 compared with AY 1999.

- Public baccalaureate institutions **increased** enrollment by over 600 this year compared with AY 1999. Community college enrollments increased by almost 3,300.
- **Therefore, while overall enrollment increased substantially, it simply did not increase as quickly as budgeted.**

### The 2000 Master Plan

The current enrollment shortfall at two of the baccalaureate institutions appears to be at odds with the HECB Master Plan goal to increase upper-division enrollment and calls into question the level of student demand at baccalaureate institutions. Therefore, it is important to examine the causes for this apparent shortfall, and carefully consider any implications for enrollment goals that call for growth in the future.

### Understanding the Current Enrollment Situation

Three main factors help to explain the enrollment situation in the baccalaureate institutions in AY 2000.

**1. An unanticipated change in course-taking behavior.** A significant factor in the under-enrollment at Washington State University seems to be an unanticipated change in course-taking behavior that has changed the traditional conversion rate from headcount to FTE enrollment. In fall 1998, the average on-campus student at WSU-Pullman enrolled in 15.00 credit hours. In fall 1999, the average on-campus student enrolled in 14.83 credit hours, resulting in a campus-wide reduction of 150 FTEs given the same number of students. This factor accounts for most of the under-enrollment at WSU-Pullman. The reduced course load also occurred at Western Washington University, although Western did meet their budgeted enrollment level for the academic year.

This drop in average course load last year at the two affected institutions can be attributed to three key things: 1) more strict monitoring by the registrar of course pre-requisites, resulting in enrollment cancellations, 2) the introduction of freshman courses that carried fewer credits than the courses they replaced, and 3) more students entering as freshmen with college credit and taking fewer classes as a result. The first two of these causes are straightforward and institutions are working to address them.

The third cause is somewhat more complicated. Opportunities are increasing for students to bring credits with them as they enter college from popular programs such as Running Start, College in the High School, and advanced placement. And students are using these already-earned credits in a variety of ways that make sense for their personal situation. Some students use these credits to accelerate program completion and move quickly into upper-division and graduate coursework. Others are choosing to reduce their course load and take the same amount of time to complete their degree. This is often necessary since many students must work to finance the costs of their education and meet family responsibilities.

In addition, students at all levels are obtaining credits from electronic providers that supplement and/or supplant credits that would otherwise be earned in a traditional mode. In this case, students are still earning credits and making progress toward program completion even though they appear to be attending less than full-time. This phenomenon is expected to continue, and likely grow, as electronic and other non-traditional alternatives proliferate.

**2. Fewer high school graduates entering baccalaureate institutions.** The primary source of baccalaureate freshmen is Washington high school graduates. In fall 1999, 97 fewer Washington high school graduates enrolled in baccalaureate institutions as freshmen than in fall 1998, even though the number of high school graduates increased by over 2,000. Typically, baccalaureate institutions enroll about one of every six new high school graduates. Thus, an increase of 2,000 graduates would be expected to increase baccalaureate entrance by over 300, rather than drop by 97. This situation was not anticipated.

Generally, high school graduates have three options: 1) enter the workforce, 2) enroll in an in-state public post-secondary institution, or 3) enroll in a non-public post-secondary institution (either in-state or out-of-state).

*1. The workforce*

Finding data about how many students choose to enter the workforce directly after high school is difficult. One could assume that the healthy economy and availability of jobs might entice some potential students to defer their education in favor of work. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and the HECB have jointly supported follow up studies of high school graduate competencies and choices. The most recent Graduate Follow-up Study, completed by Jerry Litzenberger in April 2000, provides us with some data on the work/education choices of spring 1998 graduates. According to Litzenberger, about 2 percent fewer high school graduates went directly to work compared to spring 1997. While this is not a definitive answer regarding the behavior of spring 1999 graduates, the economy has been healthy across the entire three-year span so a marked increase in the number of high school graduates entering the workforce in 1999 seems unlikely.

*2. In-state public post-secondary institutions*

Students may enroll in either community colleges or baccalaureate institutions. According to SBCTC data, the 1999 enrollment of new high school graduates in community colleges does not indicate a higher rate of community college attendance. Thus, students who did not attend the baccalaureate institutions did not choose to enroll instead in the community colleges.

*3. Non-public post-secondary institutions*

If the additional high school graduates did not work or attend public institutions at the same rates as in previous years, an obvious alternative is attendance in non-public institutions (either in-state or out-of-state). However, this is very difficult to

substantiate. In addition to traditional private institutions, there is a proliferation of electronic alternatives to obtain either skill development or to pursue a degree or certificate. There is no good source for data about the number of electronic students since technology has now removed traditional geographic boundaries. However, we do have anecdotal evidence from across the state that Washington high school graduates are increasingly viewed by all sorts of private institutions as an attractive market. The relative affluence of the state, its familiarity with technology in delivering education, and increasing numbers of high school graduates make Washington a recruiting target for both traditional and non-traditional private institutions from all geographic areas. High school counselors consistently report increasing representation by private and out-of-state institutions at college nights and more recruiting contacts with students.

Complicating the analysis of high school graduate enrollment behavior is a data collection issue. Recent high school graduates who have accumulated Running Start credits at a community college may appear in the data as transfer students—rather than as students entering from high school. If the Running Start credits were earned at the baccalaureate institution where they enroll, the new students may be listed as continuing students. However, as discussed in the next section, we did not see a commensurate increase in transfer students to explain the drop in high school enrollees. Thus, the question about how Running Start students are counted is still on the table. The OFM Application Match Study should shed some light on this question.

The best test of whether the AY 2000 experience was an anomaly is to look at what is happening with fall 2000 freshmen acceptances and deposits. Freshmen enrollments will be higher at both the University of Washington and Western Washington University. Traditionally, when this occurs, it tends to restrict the number of entering freshmen at east side institutions. In September the enrollment numbers for east side campuses will be available. The institutions will continue to analyze trends and student choices and communicate any additional information obtained.

**1. Fewer transfer students entering baccalaureate institutions.** Another major source of baccalaureate enrollment is transfer students. In fall 1999, 705 fewer students transferred to baccalaureate institutions as compared to fall 1998. Transfers from Washington institutions were down 850 and transfers from out-of-state institutions were up 145. Institutions had expected an increase rather than a decrease in the number of transfer students from Washington institutions since the number of transfer-ready students continues to grow. The flow of these transfers did improve in the remainder of AY 2000 so the total for the entire year was only down 138 students (just 1.5 percent).

Baccalaureate transfers come from three sources: out-of-state institutions, Washington community colleges, and other Washington baccalaureate institutions. It seems reasonable to postulate that the effects of a healthy economy might be more pronounced on the behavior of potential transfer students for a number of reasons: 1) they have some

education already completed, 2) would likely have more options in the job market than high school graduates, and 3) are older and may choose to put off additional education or pursue it in non-traditional ways. They may also choose not to relocate to a distant campus of a baccalaureate institution for personal or economic reasons.

The community colleges and baccalaureate institutions are examining how transfer students make their choices, and what can be done to assist these students make efficient progress toward their goals. It is also interesting to note that transfer experience from the community colleges to baccalaureate institutions differs among the institutions. According to SBCTC data, community college transfers for AY 2000 compared to AY 1999 were: up at the University of Washington (5 percent), Western Washington University (19 percent), and Eastern Washington University (8 percent); and down at The Evergreen State College (1 percent), Central Washington University (8 percent), and Washington State University (23 percent). This is an area that will receive ongoing attention from the institutions.

Analyzing the reduction in transfers among the baccalaureate institutions is a more complicated matter. Some of the same considerations clearly apply: students may choose to enter the work force or delay additional education, or they may choose not to relocate to another campus. However, the factors underlying a decision not to transfer among baccalaureate institutions may also be affected by choices of fields of study. Different baccalaureate institutions offer different programs, and the mix is constantly changing. In addition, branch campuses, extended learning centers and distance education opportunities are growing and offering more programs every year. These factors may reduce the need for some students to transfer among baccalaureate institutions to obtain the program they desire. This is a positive outcome for the students.

Finally, the number of transfer students that come from any Washington public institution may decrease for one of the same reasons that high school graduates are making other choices—recruiting by private and out-of-state institutions. Potential transfer students are an attractive market for these institutions for the same reasons that high schools graduates are: relative affluence of the state, use of technology in delivering education, and increasing numbers. This is also a positive outcome for the students in that it offers more choices among pathways to achieve their educational goals.

The baccalaureate institutions will not be able to report fall term AY 2001 transfer entrance data until later in the fall. Transfer deadlines are later than new student application deadlines. Institutions are continuing to analyze the reasons for the fall 1999 experience and will communicate any additional information obtained.

### **Future Implications**

The remaining question is whether any of the three factors discussed above may have significant and ongoing impact on the enrollment projections or goals that were put forward in the HECB Master Plan. The future significance of each of the three factors



will be discussed below. However, as a basis for that discussion, it is important to clarify how future enrollment planning options have been viewed in recent enrollment planning discussions.

The basis for looking at future enrollment planning options will be OFM's most recent enrollment projections for maintaining the current service level of higher education enrollment—under current higher education policies and practices. This is defined as the same proportion of students attending college, adjusted only for changes in the age and sex distribution of the population. Since overall population is growing, the enrollment levels to maintain current service levels will increase a commensurate amount.

The primary benefit of using OFM's updated projections of current service level comes from using the latest data available, which includes actual enrollment numbers for AY 2000 and the most recent population forecast. Both of these data elements have been revised since the HECB Master Plan was completed. In addition to the OFM forecast, a number of variables and policy choices will be separately identified, discussed, and quantified (where possible). This approach allows for a clear discussion of the separate impacts of each variable or policy choice. Although many of these variables and policy choices are inter-related, we will examine each one separately. With this framework in mind, following is a discussion of each of the factors affecting AY 2000 baccalaureate enrollments identified above, and their implications for future enrollment planning.

### **1. Unanticipated change in course-taking behavior**

Institutions affected by this phenomenon are fully aware of it and are taking actions to address those areas where they can have an effect. An improved approach to ensuring that course pre-requisites are fulfilled will help to reduce the number of cancelled course registrations. Freshman-only introductory courses are being redesigned to fit within a full course load. And improved advising will help incoming students enroll in a full load of classes where appropriate.

### **2. Fewer high school graduates entering baccalaureate institutions**

Institutions have been expanding their recruiting efforts at Washington high schools. The baccalaureate institutions will report their fall 2000 enrollments in September so the impact of these efforts can be assessed. Institutions will continue to put a major emphasis on reaching out to high school students in new and creative ways to make them aware of college opportunities.

### **3. Fewer transfer students entering baccalaureate institutions**

The community colleges and baccalaureate institutions are working together to make the transition to upper division education as efficient as possible for students. Clarifying and communicating entrance requirements, and ensuring that community college students select the appropriate courses for transfer are important efforts that will help to improve transfer rates. Institutions will continue to focus attention on this area.

More work needs to be done to understand changes in transfer behavior among the baccalaureate institutions. Some of the causes, such as increased access to programs in a variety of locations, may be a positive factor that should be reinforced. As institutions better understand transfer student choices, they will take appropriate actions. However, transfers from other baccalaureate institutions only account for about 20 percent of all transfers. Marginal changes in this factor, in either direction, will have limited impact on future enrollment levels. Institutions are continuing to analyze the reasons for the AY 2000 experience and will communicate any new information.

### **Summary**

The purpose of this discussion is to identify those factors that may have caused the current under-enrollment at some of the baccalaureate institutions, examine those factors, and determine if they will have continuing impact on enrollment planning in the future. Three factors were identified and examined:

- The first two factors identified (reduced course loads and fewer high school graduates enrolling) are being addressed by the institutions where appropriate. The effect of these institutional efforts will be measured and reported.
- The reduction in transfer students is a more complicated issue to understand. If students are choosing not to transfer with full information about their opportunities and for the appropriate reasons, then this is not a problem. If students are not transferring because they are not aware of options, then efforts to provide this information must be redoubled. This area requires further study.

As an aside, it seems that many of the factors relating to student choices seem to indicate that more students may be expected to take fewer courses on the average in future years. This will be particularly true of lifelong learners who have work and family obligations to balance with their educational endeavors. This is important to recognize since serving relatively more students (headcount) but generating a relatively lower average FTE level can create added costs for institutions—since FTEs is the basis for state funding allocations. Future budget discussions will need to take this changing situation into account.

### **Conclusion**

At the request of the Legislature, the higher education community in Washington State has held many discussions and conducted substantial analysis to understand the needs and behavior of potential students. Public and private institutions have been involved along with other organizations that are concerned with demographic trends and meeting workforce demands. Much has been learned, and much remains to be learned. Following are the major conclusions:

- Higher education enrollment increased substantially in the 1999-2000 academic year, but not by as much as planned (and budgeted) at two of the baccalaureate institutions.
- Public institutions need to reach out to prospective students (high school and transfer) to educate them about opportunities, and help them achieve their educational goals.
- The public institutions have taken corrective action in response to the AY 2000 enrollment experience. They will report on the success of these efforts next fall.
- Notwithstanding the best efforts of institutions, there are aspects to student decision-making about their future that cannot be forecasted or controlled. Enrollment forecasting and management is as much an art as a science.
- Public institutions will temper their future requests for enrollment increases in light of the experience in this last fiscal year. Achieving or exceeding enrollment targets and budgets seem to be an expectation by the public and decision-makers, while being slightly below the target is a significant cause for concern. Discussion of some flexibility in setting of budgetary enrollment targets should begin.
- The changing face of institutions, technology, program needs, student expectations and needs, delivery modes, alternative providers, etc. require that enrollment planning receive continual attention by institutions and state decision-makers. Simply relying on past trends will no longer suffice.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-25**

WHEREAS, The Washington State Legislature approved Engrossed Substitute Senate Concurrent Resolution 8425, commending the Higher Education Coordinating Board for its work in producing the 2000 update of the Master Plan for Higher Education, *The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner, Strategies to Meet the Challenge*; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature directed the Board and its staff to refine and re-examine its assumptions and forecasts of enrollment growth and related capital needs of the state's public colleges and universities, including the role of the community and technical colleges in accommodating additional higher education students; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has asked the HECB to communicate regularly regarding these assigned tasks; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature has directed the Board to proceed with the implementation of the Master Plan as provided in ESSCR 8425, and to report to the 2001 Legislature on the progress of such implementation; and

WHEREAS, The Board reviewed, and, in May 2000, adopted an approach to analyzing long-term higher education enrollment needs in Washington State on the basis of clearly identified policy options; and

WHEREAS, A study team including a broad array of participants has reach preliminary findings in each of the policy areas about key questions and required data; and

WHEREAS, The study team has reviewed and discussed capital and space planning assumptions in the 2000 Master Plan and found them to be reasonable factors to use to scope long-term postsecondary capital needs;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board endorses the work of the study team and its preliminary findings on enrollment analysis, and final conclusions on capital and space planning assumptions as presented at the Board's July 26, 2000, meeting; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the staff of the HECB is directed to communicate this resolution and related information to the appropriate members and committees of the Legislature and the Office of the Governor, and to the institutions and organizations that have been involved in the development process; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board express its sincere appreciation to the many people who have participated in the discussions and analysis regarding enrollment and space planning, and looks forward to further discussion and refinement of this study effort.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_

## **MASTER PLAN “RULES” REVIEW**

### **Status Report**

*July 2000*

### **BACKGROUND**

During the development of the 2000 Master Plan for Higher Education, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) traveled all over Washington State to meet with people interested in higher education: students, faculty, staff, administrators, business owners, community leaders and many others. One theme that emerged during these meetings was the need to “cut red tape” in higher education. The Board agreed with Washington citizens that unnecessary impediments to student learning should be identified and removed.

### **Master Plan Rules Review Process**

The Master Plan adopted five goals reflecting the Board’s policy that the interests and needs of learners must be the first priority of public higher education. To this end, the Master Plan calls for a comprehensive review of how existing rules, regulations, and practices at the state and institutional levels could be changed to better meet the needs of learners. To carry out this review, the Master Plan identified the following actions and timelines as part of the implementation strategy for Goal 5: *To help colleges and universities meet student needs and compete in an increasingly complex marketplace:*

#### **a.) Strategy: Identify and remove unwarranted obstacles to articulation and meeting student program demand.**

**1. By June 2000, public colleges and universities,** in collaboration with **faculty** and **students**, will identify institutional and other obstacles to meeting students’ program demand and (identify) barriers to students’ academic progress.

**2. By October 2000, the HECB** will analyze (the above) institutional reports and, if warranted, work across sectors and institutions to develop solutions that can be piloted within “opportunity zones.” These pilot projects and high-demand programs to which the state should target FTE enrollments will be included in the budget recommendations to the Legislature and Governor.

This review process focuses on *student needs* and — based upon the observations and ideas of institutions, faculty, and students — identifying how existing regulations or practices at the state and institutional levels could be changed to better meet those needs. An important part of the study is the identification of possible demonstration projects or “opportunity zones” to test proposed solutions.

This report provides an update on the status of the rules review project and a discussion of the obstacles and solutions identified thus far by institutions, faculty, and students. No Board action is required.

## PROJECT STATUS

At the May 25, 2000 meeting of the HECB, the Board received a briefing on the status of the project. That briefing reviewed the Master Plan goal of identifying and removing unnecessary obstacles to student progress, summarized the study process, and discussed emergent themes or issues identified in a series of informational meetings held throughout the state.

Following the May meeting, staff received written input from institutions and students identifying and describing obstacles to student progress and suggestions for possible solutions. As discussed in the next section, a wide variety of obstacles and solutions were identified.

Staff will be working with the institutions, faculty, and student representatives in July and August to prioritize the obstacles and to achieve a consensus on proposed solutions and potential demonstration projects. Based on this collaboration, the Board will be provided with a final report of findings and recommendations for consideration at its September meeting.

## IDENTIFIED OBSTACLES AND SOLUTIONS

The obstacles and solutions reported by the institutions, faculty, and students fell into the following eight categories:

1. Transfer and Articulation
2. Financial Aid
3. Tuition and Fees
4. Course Availability
5. Program Availability
6. State Budgeting Practices
7. Student Services and Support
8. K-12 Linkages

The reported obstacles represent a wide variety of administrative and regulatory practices that can constrain student progress and institutional effectiveness. Some identified obstacles are unambiguous and the identified solutions are correspondingly straightforward. For example, the “2 Credit Rule” (which requires students at the public four-year institutions to enroll for a minimum of two credits per academic term) could be eliminated by striking language from current law.

Other identified obstacles are *seemingly* unambiguous, but their solutions can be quite complex. For example, the development of a common course numbering system to improve transfer and articulation appears a logical and straightforward proposal. However, it would require each unique public baccalaureate institution to agree to accept any course, based on its number, rather than an assessment of the program that generated the course. Similarly, reconciling the definition of “full-time student” for purposes of calculating tuition levels and for determining financial aid eligibility seems to be an obviously sensible move. However, the definitions

currently differ. State financial aid rules utilize the standard adopted by the larger federal programs so that aid from all sources can be coordinated.

Last, some of the identified obstacles can be extraordinarily complex, requiring challenging and multifaceted solutions. Underlying or embedded in such obstacles can be issues reflecting the complexity of institutional culture and organizational structure, historical legislative policies, and even broader cultural beliefs and values. Residency and citizenship policies for enrollment at public institutions are examples of such complex policies and practices.

The above suggests that differing amounts of time and effort will be needed to effectively remove or minimize the various obstacles to student progress and institutional effectiveness. As stated earlier, HECB staff will be working in collaboration with the institutions, faculty, and students to more fully understand these obstacles and to determine where feasible solutions could be implemented. The findings and recommendations resulting from this collaboration will be reported to the Board in September 2000.

### **Program Review**

State law [RCW 28B.80.340] directs the HECB to perform a number of responsibilities regarding the establishment of baccalaureate academic programs, including but not limited to the following:

1. Approve the creation of any new degree program; and
2. Review, evaluate, and make recommendations for the modification, consolidation or elimination of on- and off-campus programs.

The HECB’s *Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval, and Review* guides the process for those activities. In addition to HECB program planning guidelines, each institution has its own set of processes faculty must go through in order to initiate or change a program.

### **1998 Review Streamlines Program Planning Process**

In 1998, in consultation with the public baccalaureate institutions, the HECB reviewed and streamlined the Board’s *Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval, and Review*. Major changes in the guidelines then included the following:

1. Reducing the length and frequency of institutional program plans from yearly, four-year plans, to biennial, two-year program plans.
2. Reducing the proposal paperwork and detail required in order to move an existing program to a new location.
3. Creating a “fast-track” review and approval process for those programs that were not included in the program plan, did not gain pre-approval status, and need to be implemented immediately to meet a clear and urgent need.

**2000 HECB Program Review**

This year, in coordination with the Master Plan Rules Review project, HECB staff has initiated a review of the Board’s existing *Guidelines for Program Planning, Approval, and Review*. In accomplishing this task, staff is engaged in several activities:

- **Provost recommendations.** Requesting written recommendations from the provosts on how to improve the *Guidelines*.
- **Faculty and staff training and suggestions.** Conducting campus visits over the summer months to present to staff and faculty a seminar, *How to Write the Perfect HECB Proposal*. These workshops also provided HECB staff an excellent opportunity to solicit recommendations from faculty and staff about how to improve the *Guidelines*. So far, the seminars have involved about 100 faculty and academic administrators.
- **Soliciting input from academic program planners.** Participating in the Inter-institutional Committee on Academic Program Planning (ICAPP) summer retreat to discuss how to improve the *Guidelines*.
- **Discussions with legislative staff.** HECB staff will meet with legislative staff to brief them on the program review activities and discuss initial recommendations.

Based on the recommendations presented by the institutions, other interested parties, and a review of best practices, the *Guidelines* will be revised accordingly by the end of the year. It is anticipated that staff will present draft revisions to institutions in early fall for their review and comment. The Board will consider the draft in October, and final *Guidelines* for adoption in December.

At the July 2000 Board meeting, staff will summarize major themes and comments relating to how to improve the program planning and approval process.



## E-LEARNING TRAINING INITIATIVE

July 2000

### BACKGROUND

The E-learning<sup>1</sup> Training Initiative is part of the 2000 Master Plan for Higher Education, *The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner: Strategies to Meet the Challenge*. Goal 4 of the plan is to “Enhance higher education opportunity through greater use of E-learning strategies.”<sup>2</sup> It encourages the use of electronic technologies and pedagogical methods to enhance the quality of public higher education, and to address the state’s enrollment, fiscal, and capital development needs. In the plan, the Board recognized that integrating these new technologies into traditional teaching and learning methods is not automatic. Faculty and staff need training in the use of new technologies, and how to adapt traditional curriculum and pedagogy to E-learning. The 2000 Master Plan identified the E-learning Training Initiative as a strategy to promote the expanded adoption of e-learning technologies.

**Project Goals.** Up until now, each of the state’s higher education institutions has taken a different approach to e-learning training. The E-learning Training Initiative supports Goal 4 by leveraging the best thinking and most useful strategies of each institution on behalf of faculty and staff at all public institutions, two-year and four-year. The initiative is designed to ‘raise the bar’ through the following strategies:

1. establishing training and competency targets and benchmarks,
2. creating a forum for sharing ideas and approaches, and
3. fostering system-wide activities to induce and integrate ‘best practice’ in use of e-learning technologies throughout the system.

Coordinated e-learning training also will provide operational and communications efficiencies for use of the K-20 network by establishing shared procedures and practices among instructors and staff across institutions and educational sectors.

The Master Plan’s Goal 4 strategy outlines the following action plan:

- Conduct a training needs assessment and inventory current activities.
- Develop systemic benchmarks for training and technological competency across institutions.
- Identify system-wide E-training needs and goals.
- Devise a statewide training plan with goals and objectives attached.
- Coordinate inter-institutional, cross-sector strategies to leverage training, expertise, and funding.
- Develop incentive packages to reward innovation and excellence in e-teaching.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Master Plan’s use of the term E-Learning includes all uses of technology for instruction including distance learning, web-centric instruction, online instruction, interactive video and pre-recorded media.

<sup>2</sup> 2000 Master Plan for Higher Education, *The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner: Strategies to Meet the Challenge*, Goal 4, Strategy A., page 12.

**Project Status.** The E-Training Advisory Team has been established and consists of representatives from both the public baccalaureate college and universities and community and technical colleges. Representatives to the advisory group include the following:

Baccalaureate Institutions:

Bill Bruner TESC  
Mary Doyle, WSU  
Larry Gilbert WWU  
David Kaufman, CWU  
David Rand, EWU  
Dave Szatmary, UW Extension  
Don Wulff, UW  
Leslie Wyckoff, WSU  
Vancouver

HECB Staff:

Parker Lindner (lead), Patty  
Mosqueda, Jim Reed

Community Colleges:

Suanne Carlson, Distance  
Learning Coordinator, SBCTC  
Connie Broughton, WA Online  
Mark Veljkov, Skagit Valley CC  
Mary M. Carr, Spokane CC  
Joe Dial, Seattle CC District

Ex-Officio Contributors:

Susanne James, WWU & ICAPP  
(Inter-Institutional Committee for  
Academic Program Planning)  
Cindy Flynn, COP

The advisory team has worked with HECB staff to create a Phase I survey to define the range of e-training activities and needs (please see attached survey). The initial survey will be used to develop an overview of current e-learning training opportunities and perceived needs. From that assessment, the advisory team can map out its strategic plan. Once the plan is identified, the team will refine its analytical approach and build a funding request based on the systemic needs and benchmarks identified.

Analysis of the Phase I survey will be completed by mid-summer. The advisory team will then review its findings, draft training benchmarks, and release a preliminary action plan, including a project funding request for the 2001-2003 biennial budget.

**BOARD ACTION**

No Board action is required. This report is presented for information only.

Institution \_\_\_\_\_

**JUNE, 2000**

Name & Title \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail & Phone \_\_\_\_\_

## **Washington State Higher Education E-Learning Training Survey**

The HECB Master Plan 2000 includes a goal to enhance higher education opportunity through greater use of E-learning technologies. In setting this goal, the HECB recognizes that faculty and staff need training to make use of these technologies and incorporate them into teaching and support practices.

For the purposes of this survey, E-Learning shall be generally defined as all uses of technology for instruction including distance learning, web-centric instruction, online instruction, interactive video, and pre-recorded media.

This questionnaire is designed to establish a snapshot of existing E-learning training resources, activities and programs. It includes a survey of existing activities and questions to determine what additional training resources are needed. The goal is to identify existing resources that can be shared and leveraged, to recognize training initiatives of particular merit, and to identify some system-wide training goals for which funding can be sought. Thank you for your efforts and cooperation!

### ***Section I – Short Answer Questions - Please attach sheet if needed.***

#### **A: Administration, Staffing and Promotion**

1. Who administers existing E-Learning or Distance Learning training on your campus? (e.g., IT, faculty development, department tech support, special initiative/teaching center, other)
2. What personnel at your institution are assigned or available to train faculty and staff in the application of E-Learning?
3. Through what means are training opportunities advertised or promoted at your institution?

#### **B: Funding**

1. How does your institution currently fund E-Learning training? Please list sources (e.g., departmental funding, operations, skim, special allocation from general budget, etc. Enter dollar amount if known.)
2. Are there incentives or stipends associated with E-Learning training or professional development on your campus? (please describe)

#### **C: Needs**

1. In your opinion what additional E-Learning and distance learning training opportunities would best serve the needs of your faculty and staff?
2. What additional resources would foster development of E-Learning on your campus? (please be specific)

Institution \_\_\_\_\_

**JUNE, 2000**

Name & Title \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail & Phone \_\_\_\_\_

### **D: Specialized Software**

Does your campus, department or course utilize course management software? (if so, please specify)

If yes, for whom do you provide specialized training on this software? (please check)

\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty          \_\_\_\_\_ Students

### ***Section II – E-Training Partnerships, Collaborations and Resources***

Please list any E-learning training collaborations or partnerships with other higher education institutions:

List existing E-training collaborations with K-12:

Please list any E-training collaborations or partnerships with private enterprise:

What existing workshops or resources could you share with other system members?

### ***Section III - Attachments***

Please attach any available materials from this list. Feel free to include additional materials you deem appropriate.

- Strategic plans for E-Training
- Mission statements for training units
- Lists of available short courses or workshops
- Job descriptions for trainers, training department leaders or IT support staff
- URLs for specialized training, workshops or learning opportunities
- URLs for threaded discussions on e-learning training
- Newsletters and flyers regarding training units and opportunities
- Information on available self-produced resources
- Descriptions of specific partnerships or collaborative training opportunities

## Section IV – Training Mode & Modality Inventory

For each subject area, indicate availability by subject matter and type of delivery.

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name & Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 E-Mail & Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

	MODALITY										
SUBJECT AREA	Formal F2F Training (classes & workshops)	One-to-One Instruction	Printed Materials	Video Tapes or Other Pre-Recorded Materials	External Conferences and Workshops	Organized Mentoring	Computer Based Training Modules	Online & Threaded Discussion Opportunities	Online Content or Web-Based Training	Other	Comments
IT/Software/ Applications											
Web Skills and Authoring											
Distance Learning Pedagogy and Techniques											
Instructional Design											
Library and Information Retrieval											
Presentation Hardware											
Online Course Management (for faculty)											
Training for Distance Education Support Personnel											
Copyright											
Other (list)											

Please return this survey by July 14 to: Parker Lindner, Higher Education Coordinating Board, 917 Lakeridge Way, P.O. Box 43430, Olympia 98504-3430.  
 If you have any questions, please call (360-753-7821) or e-mail ([parkerl@hecb.wa.gov](mailto:parkerl@hecb.wa.gov)). Thank you!

June, 2000

# **MASTER OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTANCY**

## **Central Washington University at Ellensburg, SeaTac, and Lynnwood**

*July 2000*

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Central Washington University is seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board approval to establish a Master of Professional Accountancy at its main campus in Ellensburg, and at CWU centers at SeaTac and Lynnwood. The program would complement the CWU undergraduate program in accounting offered at these locations. Last year, CWU's Department of Accounting was one of the largest undergraduate degree granting programs at Central, and the institution is committed to promoting ongoing excellence into the graduate program.

#### **PROGRAM NEED**

The HECB deferred "pre-approval" status for this proposal in April 1998. The need for the program is based on several factors.

1. Changes in the profession that now require an applicant for a certified public accountant (CPA) certificate to complete at least 150 semester hours of college education including a baccalaureate degree or higher and an accounting concentration. In other words, those individuals who want to pursue a CPA career would have to complete a fifth year of college.
2. Accounting firms participating in CWU focus groups relating to the proposed degree program indicated that Master of Professional Accountancy students would be better qualified than Master of Business Administration students.
3. A combination of the dot.com company competition and the fifth-year requirement is seriously decreasing the supply of accountants available in public firms.
4. Other program alternatives are very limited. For example, Washington State University will have some excess capacity for qualified students, but it would only be available to those students who relocate to Pullman.
5. Student interest is high. Surveys of over 300 CWU students who plan to graduate with a degree in accounting reveal that about 270 of these students plan to be CPAs.
6. Twelve letters of support from industry endorsing the program are included with the proposal.

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The program requires completion of 46 quarter credits: 31 credits in accounting/management core courses and 15 credits in elective courses. One unique feature of the program is its emphasis on writing and presentation skills. Students will have to write a journal article, a customer value survey, a business plan, and continuing education materials. Some students also will develop interactive web pages. The results of students' work will be presented to the business community for review and comment.

The program is designed to serve 50 FTE students. Most students will enroll on a part-time basis and complete the program in about four quarters, including summer quarter.

The program will be delivered at the three locations by on-site faculty and distance learning technologies. Reallocation of current faculty and support resources will be used to implement the program. In addition 2.5 faculty and support staff will have to be hired.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The proposal presents an assessment plan that includes program goals and objectives, expected student learning outcomes, and how these will be evaluated. The proposal also presents a diversity plan that includes initiatives to recruit and retain persons of color or disability.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

In reviewing this proposal, HECB staff worked extensively with Dr. Roy Savoian, Dean of the CWU School of Business and Economics.

In accordance with the *HECB Guidelines*, the proposal was reviewed by two external reviewers: Dr. Ronald M. Mano, Department Chair of the School of Accountancy at Weber State University and Jean Pryor, CPA for MOSS-ADAMS LLP in Yakima, Washington. Both reviewers gave the proposal high ratings. Additionally, the proposal was reviewed by the other public baccalaureate institutions. Washington State University and Western Washington University shared their general support for the proposed program. Both institutions also had a couple of questions or comments that CWU addressed satisfactorily.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The Master of Professional Accountancy will be supported through a combination of internal reallocation and new state funds. The cost per FTE student is about \$6,880.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed program will meet the new requirements in the accounting profession. It will also increase the supply of accountants with advanced skills. Furthermore, the program will be offered at a reasonable cost and make efficient use of institutional resources. Finally, the program of study offers students a challenging suite of educational offerings and assignments.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Central Washington University proposal to establish a Master of Accountancy at its main campus in Ellensburg and centers at SeaTac and Lynwood is recommended for approval, effective July 26, 2000.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-26**

WHEREAS, Central Washington University has requested approval to establish a Master of Professional Accountancy at its main campus in Ellensburg and centers at SeaTac and Lynwood; and

WHEREAS, The program will contribute to the professionalism of the field; and

WHEREAS, The program appears popular among employers and students; and

WHEREAS, The program will be offered at a reasonable cost and make efficient use of institutional resources; and

WHEREAS, The program of study offers students an advanced suite of educational offerings and assignments;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Central Washington University proposal to establish a Master of Professional Accountancy at its main campus in Ellensburg and centers at SeaTac and Lynwood, effective July 26, 2000.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair



## **BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE**

### **University of Washington at Tacoma and Bothell**

*July 2000*

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

##### **INTRODUCTION**

The University of Washington's (UW) two branch campuses, UW Tacoma and UW Bothell are seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval to offer a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science. At this time, the UW's main campus in Seattle is also seeking HECB approval to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies.

##### **PROGRAM NEED**

Both environmental science programs were granted "pre-approval" status by the HECB in March 2000. The HECB recognized that the two branch campuses have different strengths with respect to environmental education; Tacoma has a high level of involvement with local government and community organizations, and Bothell has the notable wetlands restoration project at its new campus. The need for environmental science programs at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell is strong, as documented by:

- Occupational forecasts from the Bureau of Labor Statistics;
- Regional needs assessments;
- Focus group interviews;
- Community college student surveys;
- Recent changes in state and federal environmental policies; and
- The continuing deterioration of environmental quality in the regions.

The only other BS degrees in environmental science offered in western Washington, at public or private institutions, are at Western Washington University in Bellingham and Washington State University in Vancouver. Neither of these programs are a viable option for placebound individuals in the Puget Sound area.

##### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The proposed BS in Environmental Science at UW Tacoma is based on the existing concentration in environmental science offered by the Interdisciplinary Arts and Science program. The degree requirements include 67 credits, including a 3-credit junior seminar, 41 credits in core environmental courses, 20 credits in core environmental studies courses, and a 3-credit capstone or internship experience.

The proposed BS in Environmental Science at UW Bothell has an interdisciplinary focus, a hallmark of all programs on this campus. The degree requirements include 60 credits of environmental science classes, including a minimum of 15 credits of laboratory classes and 10 credits of a capstone course.

Both programs are designed for students interested in a solid foundation in the scientific disciplines relevant to environmental issues. Graduates of either program will be well-prepared for graduate studies and/or careers with environmental organizations, governmental agencies, or the private sector.

Each program would accommodate 60 FTE students at full enrollment. It is expected that full-time students would be able to complete the program in about two years. The programs would be supported essentially by existing resources, with full-time faculty teaching the classes.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

Both programs have assessment and diversity plans that are well-suited to programs of this nature. Both campuses will use appropriate assessment measures to evaluate program effectiveness and student learning outcomes, and appropriate strategies to recruit and retain a diverse student body.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

The BS in Environmental Science was extensively reviewed by several external reviewers, including Dr. Steve Trombulak, Professor of Biology and Environmental Studies at Middlebury College, and Dr. Suzanne Worchester, Assistant Professor of Earth Systems Science and Policy at California State University, Monterey Bay. They supported the program and offered positive reviews. The environmental science proposal also was reviewed by the other public baccalaureate institutions. Western Washington University reported . . . *“Western is pleased to support the Environmental Science degrees proposed on all three University of Washington campuses. Western is also committed to the pledges made . . . that the University of Washington and Western will continue to work together . . .”*

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The BS in Environmental Science at UW Tacoma would be supported through internal reallocations, with the cost per FTE student estimated to be about \$8,900. The BS in Environmental Science at UW Bothell is estimated to cost about \$6,600 per FTE. The Tacoma program costs are higher due to equipment costs associated with construction of the new science building and costs associated with contracted services and goods and services.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This proposal would introduce a new degree program in the Puget Sound area that should be attractive to citizens in the region and to employers. The BS in Environmental Science has demonstrated student interest and occupational demand and would be supported by sufficient resources to ensure quality teaching and learning. The costs associated with both programs are reasonable.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The University of Washington proposals to establish a Bachelor of Science at the University of Washington at Tacoma and Bothell are recommended for approval, effective July 26, 2000.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-27**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington has requested to establish a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science at its branch campuses in Tacoma and Bothell; and

WHEREAS, The program appears popular among students and employers; and

WHEREAS, The curriculum and resources are sufficient to serve student needs; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the need and quality of the program; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science at its branch campuses in Tacoma and Bothell, effective July 26, 2000.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

# **MASTER OF ARTS**

## **University of Washington Tacoma**

July 2000

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The University of Washington Tacoma (UWT) proposes to offer a Master of Arts. The program would compliment UWT's undergraduate program in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS).

#### **PROGRAM NEED**

The Master of Arts was granted "pre-approval" status by the Higher Education Coordinating Board in March 2000. It would support the UWT Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences mission "*. . . to promote academic excellence by encouraging students to think, write, and speak in ways that enhance their own development, their sense of community, their ability to deal with problems of injustice and equality, as well as their dedication to positive change.*"

The program is intended to benefit the South Puget Sound region and its residents in several ways. The program will: provide opportunities for career advancement; prepare professionals to tackle increasing complex issues and challenges; prepare individuals to pursue multiple jobs and several career changes; and complement the array of specifically focused professional degree programs (e.g., nursing, education, business, occupational therapy) in the South Puget Sound region.

It is expected that students for the program will be drawn from two major sources; UWT alumni and mid-career workers in social services, health services, environmental organizations, education, state and local government, and community and civic organizations. A recent UWT survey of alumni revealed that 172 respondents would be interested in pursuing an interdisciplinary master's degree. Census data coupled with data on state and local government from WSU's Northwest Income Indicators Project indicates that there are more than 76,000 jobs in Pierce County in the fields cited above.

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

As stated in the proposal "... The major goal of this program is to educate individuals who, in their professional and public roles, will be competent in addressing a vital social need: considered and effective formulation of problem-solving action within the social, political and economic settings and institutions."

53 credits are required for completion of the program. These credits include four required core courses, electives, a final project or thesis, and a capstone course. Initially, the Master of Arts would serve 20 FTE students and grow to a steady position of 40 FTE. It is expected that a significant proportion of students will enroll on a part-time basis.

Faculty resources for the program would include existing faculty and 4 new faculty members to accommodate the projected FTE student growth. Additional support staff and library resources would also be acquired to support the Master of Arts.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The proposal presents the expected student learning outcomes and the numerous methods that would be used to assess program vitality, student learning, and faculty teaching. More specifically, the program will be evaluated with respect to adequacy of resources to support implementation of the program, diversity, advising, admission and retention, curriculum, and student learning outcomes. Fourteen student learning outcomes have been identified for the program, and they relate to the specific core courses.

The proposal also presents a series of measures to promote nondiscrimination and diversity. For example, the program will advertise in minority publications, use collegial and professional networks to help identify potential minority candidates, and participate in the UWT Diversity Committee's activities.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

In reviewing this proposal, HECB staff worked closely with the Offices of the Provosts at the University of Washington and The Evergreen State College in order to amplify for potential students the differences between the UWT graduate program and Evergreen's Master's in Public Administration.

In keeping with the *HECB Guidelines*, the Master of Arts was reviewed extensively by two external reviewers: Dr. William M. Sullivan, Senior Scholar at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Dr. Richard Madsen, Professor of Sociology at the University of California, San Diego. Both reviews were positive and constructive, and recognized the merits of this innovative interdisciplinary program. Additionally, the proposal was reviewed by the other public baccalaureate institutions; Evergreen was the only university that commented.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The Master of Arts would be funded by internal reallocation and new state funds. The program costs at full enrollment would be about \$414,900, or \$10,370 per FTE student.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The program will serve regional needs in the South Puget Sound region. The interdisciplinary program of study will provide students with a high quality program. The proposed program reflects the allocation of resources to respond to changes in the marketplace. It will be the only program of its kind in the South Puget Sound region.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The University of Washington Tacoma proposal to establish a Master of Arts is recommended for approval, effective July 26, 2000.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-28**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington Tacoma has requested approval to establish a Master of Arts; and

WHEREAS, The program will prepare individuals with knowledge and skills sought by public and private employers in the South Puget Sound region; and

WHEREAS, The program reflects the wise allocation of resources to respond to a changing marketplace; and

WHEREAS, The assessment and diversity plans are suitable for a program of this nature;

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the quality of the program; and

WHEREAS, The program costs are reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington Tacoma request to establish a Master of Arts, effective July 26, 2000.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

# **BACHELOR OF ARTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES**

## **University of Washington**

July 2000

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The University of Washington (UW) is seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies on its main campus in Seattle. The program would complement the Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Science degree programs proposed for the UW branch campuses in Tacoma and Bothell.

#### **PROGRAM NEED**

The proposed program was granted “pre-approval” status by the HECB in March 2000. As reported in the proposal “...*With its emphasis on environmental decision-making based on critical assessment of the relevant scientific, human, legal, and ethical dimensions of the issues involved, it is in direct support of some of the key elements in the University’s stated mission.*”

The need for the environmental studies program is verified by occupational projections presented by the State of Washington Bureau of Labor Statistics, surveys of environmental firms in the Pacific Northwest published by the *Puget Sound Business Journal* and the *Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce*, and the high level of interest in preserving the environment in Washington State. Student interest in the program is strong, which began as a pilot program through the UW’s General Studies degree with 42 student majors.

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The program of study is comprised of three components: 1) 15 credits of core courses; 2) a set of courses totaling 40 credits that incorporate integrating themes and domains --- population and health, ecology and conservation, and resources; and 3) a 10credit capstone experience in which students are challenged to apply what they have learned to the world outside the classroom.

The program is expected to initially accommodate 40 majors and grow to a steady state of 100 majors over three years. It is expected that full-time students would complete the program in four years.

The program would be supported primarily through existing resources. It does not have its own faculty. In keeping with the multidisciplinary approach of the program, faculty members are drawn from schools and colleges across the UW to team-teach courses each quarter.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The environmental studies program will automatically be included in the UW's standard assessment plan and procedures. In addition, the program will implement its own assessments, including exit interviews and follow-up surveys with students, and surveys and forums with employers.

The program's initiatives related to diversity and student learning outcomes are exemplary. Here are a few examples:

1. The program maintains a close working relationship with advisors in the UW's Equal Opportunity Program, which enables the program to recruit students from diverse backgrounds.
2. The program has a provision for extensive student work with off-campus organizations, which brings the students into contact with a wide variety of constituents.
3. The program will do extensive recruiting in community colleges and high schools, with an emphasis on diversity.
4. Students will assemble portfolios of their learning, beginning with lower-division environmental courses and concluding with a reflective piece in the final seminar course that reviews their UW careers.
5. Faculty will assess how the internship experiences of environmental studies graduates compare with the internship experiences of UW graduates as a whole.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

In reviewing this proposal, HECB staff worked extensively with the UW Office of the Provost, and in particular with Linda Kaye, Manager for Curriculum and Program Relations.

In accordance with the *HECB Guidelines*, the proposal was reviewed positively by several external reviewers, including Dr. Linda S. Fink, Associate Professor of Biology at Sweet Briar College and Dr. Steven W. Moore, Associate Professor of Earth Systems Science and Policy at California State University, Monterey Bay. The other public baccalaureate institutions were also invited to review and comment on the proposal. Western Washington University submitted a letter indicating their support for the program and their willingness to explore ways that the two universities might collaborate in offering this degree program.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The BA in Environmental Studies would be funded through internal reallocations. Program costs at full enrollment will be about \$5,850 per FTE student.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The interest and demand for the UW program in environmental studies is keen. The program of study is very ambitious and should prepare individuals competitively for graduate studies or careers in the field. The diversity initiatives and assessment plans are commendable. Program costs are reasonable for a program of this nature.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The University of Washington proposal to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies on its main campus in Seattle is recommended for approval, effective July 26, 2000.



**RESOLUTION NO. 00-29**

WHEREAS, The University of Washington has requested approval to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies on its main campus in Seattle; and

WHEREAS, The interest and demand for the program is keen; and

WHEREAS, The program of study will prepare individuals for graduate studies and careers in the field; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews were positive and attested to the quality of and need for the program; and

WHEREAS, The diversity and assessment plans are commendable; and

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable for a program of this nature:

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the University of Washington proposal to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies on its main campus in Seattle, effective July 26, 2000.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

## **BACHELOR OF ARTS IN EDUCATION**

### **Washington State University at Northwest Indian College**

July 2000

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

##### **INTRODUCTION**

Washington State University (WSU) is seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval for its existing Bachelor of Arts in Education at Northwest Indian College (NWIC). As stated in the program proposal... *“Initially the partnership between NWIC and WSU was to be a one-time Kellogg Foundation funded opportunity where WSU would support NWIC to develop a four-year teacher certification program. NWIC is presently three to four years from achieving accreditation status. Currently the WSU-NWIC partnership is expected to continue via a U.S. Department of Education grant to end in 2004 (entitled Co-TEACH this grant is designed to address the needs of children from impoverished communities).”*

##### **PROGRAM NEED**

The following substantiates the need for this bachelor's program.

- The shortage of American Indian and Alaska Native certified teachers has been an ongoing concern despite the rich American Indian and Alaska presence in Washington State.
- Washington has twenty school districts with Native student populations exceeding 20%; in nine of these school districts the Native student is the majority.
- A few of these school districts employ an American Indian/Alaska Native who is a certified teacher.
- Almost none of the non-native teachers and administrators in these school districts have college courses or in-service training in the area of Indian education.
- American Indian and Alaska Native students rank below the state and national average in reading, math, language, science, and social studies in all grade levels.

The goal of WSU-NWIC partnership is to train more American Indian and Alaska Native teachers to work with tribal communities and in schools that have a high Indian student enrollment.

##### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The curriculum for the WSU-NWIC teacher preparation program is the same as that offered on the WSU Pullman campus. Students are required to complete 66 semester credits, including 50 semester credits in pedagogy courses and 16 in student teaching. Courses are delivered by on-site faculty and distance learning technologies.

The program is designed as a 2+2 program where students complete the first two years of the program at NWIC, or at another institution, and the last two years at WSU.

The program can accommodate up to 20 FTE students: one cohort comprised of place-bound students engaged in full-time study; another cohort comprised of paraprofessionals who maintain employment by day and enroll part-time in evening and summer classes. The full-time cohort is expected to complete the program in two years plus a summer term while the paraprofessional cohort is expected to complete the program in three calendar years. Program graduates will earn a bachelor's degree and K-8 certification.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The proposal identifies the expected student learning outcomes and evaluation techniques. These are aligned with the teacher preparation program standards established by the State Board of Education.

The program clearly supports diversity by the very nature of its target population. It will bring more American Indians and Alaska natives into the teaching ranks.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

The proposal was sent to the provosts at the other public baccalaureate institutions for their review. Central Washington University and Eastern Washington University shared their support for the program and wished WSU success as they pursue this endeavor.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The BA in Education is supported through internal reallocation and grant funds from the Kellogg Foundation and U.S. Department of Education. The cost per FTE student is about \$8,200. The average cost per FTE student for education upper-division programs is cited as \$6,151 in the *1998 HECB Cost Study*. The unique nature of the WSU-NWIC program coupled with the limited number of potential Native applicants does not make traditional cost per FTE student comparisons entirely applicable.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The existing program offers the following benefits:

- There is a tremendous need for a teacher preparation program targeted for American Indians and Alaska natives;
- Alternative undergraduate programs in education are not available in the region;
- The program is delivered in partnership with Northwest Indian College; and
- The assessment plan is exemplary.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Washington State University proposal to offer the Bachelor of Arts in Education at Northwest Indian College is recommended for approval, effective July 26, 2000.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-30**

WHEREAS, Washington State University is seeking approval for its existing Bachelor of Arts in Education at Northwest Indian College; and

WHEREAS, There is continuing need for this program to meet the demand for American Indian and Alaska Native elementary teachers in the region; and

WHEREAS, The program has an outstanding curriculum, assessment plan, and student learning outcomes; and

WHEREAS, The program is delivered in partnership with Northwest Indian College; and

WHEREAS, The program is supported through reallocation and external grants;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Bachelor of Arts in Education at Northwest Indian College, effective July 26, 2000.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

**BACHELOR OF ARTS IN EDUCATION**  
**Washington State University at Centralia College, Lower Columbia College,  
Clark College, and WSU Vancouver**

*July 2000*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**INTRODUCTION**

Washington State University (WSU) is seeking Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) approval to extend the Bachelor of Arts in Education to Centralia College, Lower Columbia College, Clark College, and WSU Vancouver. The BA in Education with K-8 certification will be coordinated by WSU Pullman's Extended Degree Programs. WSU Vancouver will coordinate a Bilingual/English as a Second Language (BE/ESL) endorsement for one group of students.

In 1998, the HECB approved the BA in Education for delivery at Grays Harbor College in Aberdeen. Extending the program to three additional community colleges will establish an infrastructure for providing a coherent, seamless approach to teacher education across the region, and will enable resource sharing across institutions.

**PROGRAM NEED**

Several factors substantiate the need for the BA in Education in southwest Washington:

1. The BA in Education was granted "pre-approval" status by the HECB in March 2000.
2. It would be the only public, undergraduate, teacher-education program in the region.
3. Community college officials in southwest Washington asked WSU to deliver a collaborative teacher education program on their campuses. A series of orientation meetings at the potential sites generated strong expressions of interest in the program from fully qualified applicants.
4. A report published by the Southwest Washington Regional Workforce Alliance in September 1999 projects 173 annual elementary teacher openings in Clark, Cowlitz, Skamania, and Wakiakum counties over the next five years.
5. Pressures are placed on teacher supply by pending retirements of older teachers, competitive recruiting by other states, and a high turnover rate among new teachers.

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The program is designed as a 2+2 program where the community colleges offer the first two years of the program and WSU offers the second two years. The curriculum is the same as that offered on the WSU Pullman campus. Courses are delivered by on-site faculty as well as distance learning technologies.

The program will admit annual cohorts of 20-35 students at each site. Program completion is two calendar years, following completion of an Associate of Arts degree. The second two years of

the program would be completed on the community college and WSU Vancouver campuses through a compressed full-time schedule; courses offered Monday through Thursday from mid-afternoon to early evening.

## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The proposal presents the expected student learning outcomes and related evaluation techniques. The outcomes are consistent with the State Board of Education's teacher preparation program standards. The program will be reviewed and evaluated both formatively and summatively.

The BE/ESL program is specifically designed and federally funded to attract members of underrepresented groups to the teaching profession. The five-year federal grant provides full tuition scholarships for 22 paraprofessionals from a variety of language and cultural backgrounds.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

In reviewing the proposal, HECB staff worked extensively with WSU Pullman Vice President, Dr. Les Purce, Vice Provost, Dr. Don Baker, Associate Vice Provost, Dr. Jane Sherman, and WSU Vancouver Campus Executive Officer, Dr. Hal Dengerink. In addition, WSU sent the proposal to the provosts at the other public four-year institutions for their review. Central Washington University and Eastern Washington University shared their general support for the program. Additionally, Eastern shared a few collegial observations; WSU responded to them satisfactorily.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The BA in Education would be supported through internal reallocation and federal funding. The cost per FTE student is about \$6,500.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The collaborative BA in Education has numerous benefits. The program will bring more underrepresented populations to the teaching profession and maximize the use of institutional resources. It will address the teacher supply needs for the Southwest Washington region, and be delivered at a reasonable cost. Finally, the program will employ suitable assessment strategies to evaluate expected student learning outcomes.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Washington State University proposal to offer the Bachelor of Arts in Education at Centralia College, Lower Columbia College, Clark College, and WSU Vancouver, is recommended for approval, effective July 26, 2000.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-31**

WHEREAS, Washington State University is seeking approval to extend the Bachelor of Arts in Education to Centralia College, Lower Columbia College, Clark College, and WSU Vancouver; and

WHEREAS, There is demonstrated need for this program to meet the demand for elementary teachers in the region; and

WHEREAS, The program will bring more underrepresented populations to the teaching profession; and

WHEREAS, The program has a well developed assessment plan; and

WHEREAS, The program will be delivered in partnership with the three community colleges and a four-year branch campus in the region; and

WHEREAS, The program will be delivered at a reasonable cost;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves extending the Bachelor of Arts in Education to Centralia College, Lower Columbia College, Clark College, and WSU Vancouver, effective July 26, 2000.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair

## **BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING** **Washington State University at Boeing in Kent, Auburn, Renton, and Everett**

July 2000

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **BACKGROUND**

As requested by the Boeing Company, Washington State University proposes to offer a Bachelor of Science in Manufacturing Engineering at Boeing in Kent, Auburn, Renton, and Everett. The program will meet the higher education needs of Boeing's technical workforce whom the company identifies as "non-degreed engineers."

#### **PROGRAM NEED**

WSU's BS in Manufacturing Engineering is located on the WSU Vancouver branch campus. The mission of the program . . . *"is to offer an accredited engineering degree program to students in the Vancouver-Portland metropolitan region, and through distance education, to other interested students in Washington State."*

Last year, WSU conducted a needs assessment at Boeing to determine the level of interest among Boeing employees for the program. The assessment revealed keen interest in the program from about 100 employees. In addition, the program's web page has received more than 1,000 hits from Boeing employees. Based on this data, WSU expects to serve 20 FTE.

The BS in Manufacturing Engineering focuses on manufacturing technologies, processes, and principals. Thus, the program is a critical strategy for Boeing to achieve adequate production levels.

#### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The program of study for the BS in Manufacturing Engineering at the Boeing sites is the same as that offered at WSU Vancouver. Students are required to complete 57 semester credits, including 51 credits in the major and six elective credits. Courses are provided by WSU faculty at or from the WSU Vancouver, Tri-Cities, and Spokane campuses. Teaching assistants will be available at the Boeing sites as needed, and special accommodation will be made for laboratory courses.

The program is designed as a 2+2 program where students complete the first two years of the program at a community college. To date, WSU has formed partnerships with Green River and Everett community colleges.



## **ASSESSMENT AND DIVERSITY**

The proposal presents the expected student learning outcomes and assessment methodologies. The outcomes are consistent with the accreditation standards established by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology.

WSU has an institution-wide commitment to increasing diversity among its personnel and student body. The manufacturing engineering program will continue to make special efforts to recruit and retain students who are persons of color or disability. In this initiative WSU will work with the *People Organization* (human resources) at Boeing.

## **REVIEW PARTICIPANTS**

WSU sent the proposal to the provosts at the other public baccalaureate institutions for their review. The University of Washington and Central Washington University shared their support for the program.

## **PROGRAM COSTS**

The BS in Manufacturing Engineering is supported through a combination of student tuition and fees, state funds, and Boeing contributions. The cost per FTE student is about \$7,500.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposal is based on the workforce needs of one of Washington's leading industries. The program addresses the need to provide upper-division engineering education opportunities for time- and place-bound individuals. The program's assessment plan is exemplary, and the course of study is modeled after the Accreditation Board of Engineering and technology's standards, thus assuring quality instruction.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Washington State University proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Manufacturing Engineering at Boeing in Kent, Auburn, Renton, and Everett is recommended for approval, effective July 26, 2000.

**RESOLUTION NO. 00-32**

WHEREAS, Washington State University has requested approval to establish a Bachelor of Science in Manufacturing Engineering at Boeing in Kent, Auburn, Renton, and Everett; and

WHEREAS, The program will provide on-site, upper-division educational opportunities in manufacturing engineering; and

WHEREAS, The program of study and assessment plan are exemplary; and

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable for offering a science program of this nature;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University request to establish a Bachelor of Science in Manufacturing Engineering at Boeing in Kent, Auburn, Renton, and Everett, effective July 26, 2000.

Adopted:

July 26, 2000

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Craves, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gay Selby, Vice Chair